

# PARENTAL EMOTION SOCIALIZATION OF SADNESS IN BLACK ADOLESCENTS

Jennifer Manning Thomas

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology (Clinical Psychology).

Chapel Hill  
2010

Approved by:

Andrea Hussong, Ph.D.

Barbara Fredrickson, Ph.D.

Deborah Jones, Ph.D.

Mitchell Prinstein, Ph.D.

Lorraine Taylor, Ph.D.

## Abstract

JENNIFER MANNING THOMAS: Parental Emotion Socialization of Sadness in  
Black Adolescents  
(Under the direction of Andrea Hussong, Ph.D.)

This project followed a two-study design. It intended to define parental emotion socialization (PES) within a sample of older Black adolescents and to examine the influence of PES on adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness (the primary emotion associated with depression). Study 1 consisted of a series of focus groups. Participants were Black college students with an average age of 19. Results from study 1 informed the development of measures to assess facilitative and non-facilitative PES of sadness and general and race-based attitudes towards the expression of sadness. Study 2 tested the five proposed hypotheses intended to examine the frequency of facilitative PES versus non-facilitative PES of sadness; context-based PES; PES across emotions (sadness, anger, and fear); direct effects of PES on attitudes; and gender differences in PES and attitudes. Participants included 87 Black high school students with a mean age of 16. Results indicated greater facilitative PES than non-facilitative PES of sadness and a significant relationship between PES and attitudes towards sadness. Results further indicated that Black parents used emotion-specific PES strategies though PES did not differ across contexts. There also were no gender differences in PES or attitudes. Implications of these findings and future directions for research are discussed.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Andrea Hussong, for her continued guidance and expertise throughout this project. I also want to acknowledge my committee members for their suggestions and encouragement. Finally, I greatly appreciate the unwavering support provided by my friends and family. I offer a special thank you to my husband, Glenn, and my mother, Dorothy. The successful completion of this project would not have been possible without them.

## Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables .....	vii
Chapter	
Introduction .....	1
Depression from a Developmental Psychopathology Perspective .....	2
Cultural Influences on Expression of Emotion.....	4
Parental Emotion Socialization.....	7
PES in Adolescence .....	10
PES in Black Children and Adolescents.....	12
PES and Attitudes towards Sadness .....	13
Impact of Social Context on PES .....	15
PES across Emotions .....	16
Gender Differences in the PES-attitudes Relation.....	17
Summary and Study Hypotheses .....	19
Method .....	21
Study 1 Participants .....	21
Procedures.....	22
Results.....	23
Study 2 Participants .....	26
Procedures .....	27

Measures.....	29
Parental Emotion Socialization of Sadness .....	30
Parental Emotion Socialization across Emotions .....	31
Parental Emotion Socialization by Context.....	32
Attitudes toward Expression of Sadness .....	32
Validity Measures.....	32
Demographics.....	35
Results.....	36
Development of PES-sadness Measure .....	36
Development of Attitudes Measures .....	37
Examining Validity for Measures of PES and Attitudes.....	39
Hypotheses .....	40
Posthoc Analyses.....	44
Discussion .....	46
Defining PES in Black Youth .....	46
How Parents of Black Youth Use PES.....	48
Contribution of PES to Understanding Attitudes .....	51
Conclusions .....	54
Appendix A: Semi-structured Interview for Focus Groups with College Students.....	65
Appendix B: Demographics Questionnaire (Study 1) .....	66
Appendix C: Measure Development for PES Scales .....	67
Appendix D: Measure Development for Attitudes Scales .....	69
Appendix E: Anger Expression Scale.....	72

Appendix F: Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form..... 73

Appendix G: Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents..... 74

Appendix H: Demographics Questionnaire (Study 2)..... 75

References..... 77

## List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Factor Loadings for Final PES Scales .....	59
2. Factor Loadings for Final Attitudes Scales.....	60
3. Study 2 PES Items .....	61
4. Study 2 PES Items across Emotions .....	62
5. Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics for Final PES and Attitudes Scales .....	63
6. Divergent and Predictive Validity and Descriptive Statistics.....	64

## Introduction

Some theorists in the area of emotional development propose that individuals in ethnic minority groups, such as Black adolescents, have developed a value of self-control around specific negative emotions and a resistance to self-disclosure of emotions (Consedine & Magai, 2002; Le, Berenbaum, and Raghavan, 2002) as a means of protection from a history of discrimination and oppression. Consequently, we might expect that if parents of Black youth see sadness as a representation of vulnerability, then they might discourage its expression in their children. In turn, Black adolescents may develop an ambivalent or even negative attitude about the expression of sadness. Because no research has yet examined this hypothesis, I will explore how Black parents socialize their adolescents around the expression of sadness and the impact of their socialization behaviors on their adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness.

The current study builds upon previously noted differences in the expression of symptomatology and emotion between Black and White adolescents. Although epidemiological surveys do not consistently support the level of differences found in clinical studies (Lawson, 1986), research indicates that Black adolescents are more likely labeled conduct disorder, whereas White adolescents are more often diagnosed with internalizing disorders (Gibbs, 1990). Although clinician bias may in part underlie these ethnic differences (Gray-Little & Kaplan, 1998), Black and White adolescents also may differ in how they choose to express their distress. Examining this possibility, Manning (2005) showed that anger, typically considered a correlate of externalizing behaviors, was equally indicative of



externalizing and depressive syndromes in Black adolescents, but only indicative of an externalizing syndrome in White adolescents. Thus, the emotional expression and/or experience associated with depression appear to differ for Black and White youth.

These findings may be interpreted in light of potential ethnic differences in the value of emotional self-control (Consedine & Magai, 2002; Le et al., 2002). Specifically, anger, compared to more classic expressions of depression (i.e., feelings of sadness, crying), may leave adolescents less socially vulnerable and thus provide a safer and more acceptable means of expressing internalized distress for Black adolescents. Such findings may hold significant implications for accurately identifying depression in Black adolescents and understanding emotional expression, particularly around sadness (the primary emotion associated with depression), in this group. Thus, in an effort to understand sadness within Black adolescents, the current study examined specific influences (i.e., parental emotion socialization) on adolescents' attitudes toward sadness.

#### *Depression from a Developmental Psychopathology Perspective*

One of the important correlates of poor regulation of sadness is depression. Depression results from complex interrelations among psychological (e.g., affective, cognitive, socioemotional), biological (e.g., genetic, neurochemical, neuroendocrine), and social (e.g., culture, community) influences (Cicchetti & Toth, 1998). In the current study, I focus specifically on social influences. For example, there is evidence that cultural factors, including ethnicity and socioeconomic status (e.g., Manning, 2005), have been significantly associated with the development and manifestation of depressive symptoms. The family, particularly parents, has been identified as another social component that has been used to explain the development of depression in children and adolescents. Similarly, family and

cultural factors have been linked to variations in how sadness is expressed and the development of attitudes toward the expression of sadness (Consedine & Magai, 2002).

Theories emerging from a developmental psychopathology perspective have proposed that a disruption in or the unavailability of adequate parenting provide a framework for understanding the occurrence of depression (Toth, Manly, & Cicchetti, 1992). One potential route through which negative parenting practices may contribute to the development of depression is through their impact on negative cognitive styles, including beliefs and inferential styles (Goodman & Gotlib, 1999). Moreover, parenting deficits may heighten children's feelings of helplessness and rejection (Hipwell et al., 2008), both of which are risk factors for depression. For example, children who receive less supportive parenting over time develop a precarious sense of self and deficits in emotion regulation that make them increasingly vulnerable to subsequent experiences (Duggal et al., 2001; Sroufe, 1996). As such, low self-esteem, negative cognitions, feelings of helplessness and rejection, and emotion dysregulation, all classic symptoms of depression, become vulnerability factors for the development of depression through negative parenting practices and parent-child interactions.

Empirical findings also have supported the contributing role parenting plays in the development of childhood depression. For example, deficits in parenting practices such as low parental warmth and harsh parenting styles are associated with the development of depression in children and adolescents (reviewed by Hipwell et al., 2008). Specifically, significant correlations have been found between parenting characterized by high levels of criticism, rejection, and intrusiveness and children's low self-esteem, high self-criticism, and dysfunctional attitudes (Garber & Flynn, 2001). Similarly, empirical findings have indicated

that parenting practices characterized by rejection, absence of warmth and affection, lack of autonomy, and manipulation of the love relationship likely result in self-denigrating and self-blaming attitudes (Blatt & Homann, 1992; McCranie & Bass, 1984), which then increase vulnerability for depression. These findings have demonstrated consistency throughout childhood and adolescence and into young adulthood. In a sample of college freshmen, high-risk students' mothers had more negative cognitive styles and fathers showed less emotional acceptance and warmth in their parenting (Alloy et al., 2001).

Although these theories and empirical findings primarily focus on the effects of parents on the development of childhood and adolescent depression, they suggest parental effects on the manifestation of depressive symptoms (e.g., manifestation of negative cognitive styles through dysfunctional attitudes and beliefs). The current study focuses on an aspect of parenting that may be culturally influenced and have an impact on a precursor to depressive symptoms. Specifically, I examined how Black parents socialize their adolescents around the expression of sadness and how their socializing practices influence adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. To understand this relation, we must first consider how culture influences the expression of emotion more broadly.

#### *Cultural Influences on Expression of Emotion*

Research methods that consider the role of culture in psychological processes can generally be divided into two approaches (Matsumoto, 1993). The first approach adopts a cross-cultural perspective in which a target culture is understood in comparison to another, and in practice often a dominant, culture. Commonly these cross-cultural comparisons are even based on samples from different countries. Strengths of the cross-cultural approach include the explicit testing of group differences hypotheses and the power to determine

whether findings typically emerging from studies of members of a dominant culture generalize to members of a non-dominant culture. However, this approach involving both across and within-country samples also suffers from serious limitations (Matsumoto, 1993). Among these are that guiding hypotheses and theoretical models are typically generated based on studies of dominant culture group members and thus the assumptions underlying previous research also are applied to the study of the non-dominant culture. These assumptions include cultural equivalence in measurement and assessment (Fisher et al., 2002), for example. Moreover, the emphasis on cross-cultural differences between the non-dominant and dominant culture members often minimizes group similarities as well as significant within-group variation.

The second approach adopts a within-culture perspective in which hypotheses and models of psychological processes are derived and tested by study of a single cultural group (Fisher et al., 2002). Advantages of this approach are its flexibility in accounting for within-group differences and its potential for identifying unique psychological processes, particularly those for non-dominant groups that may not be present for dominant groups. Within-culture studies are often most informative in the formative stages of research, where little is understood about the essence of a psychological construct, its manifestation in a particular culture, and the range of its expression across cultural group members. These studies are particularly important when available studies suggest that culture may be an important factor to consider in understanding the psychological process at hand (Fisher et al., 2002; Matsumoto, 1993).

Of these two approaches to culturally informative research, the within-culture approach is most useful in the context of the current study for several reasons. First, very

little is currently known about Black adolescents' attitudes toward the emotional expression of sadness or about the potential contributors to those attitudes. Thus, research on Black adolescents' expressions of sadness is in the formative stage.

Second, existing studies nonetheless indicate that culture has a significant impact on the expression of emotion (Le et al., 2002). Although most evidence for such cultural differences comes from cross-national comparisons (Matsumoto, 1993), studies of ethnic differences within U.S. residents also are consistent with this conclusion. For example, Consedine and Magai (2002) found that, on average, Black and African Caribbean adults were less emotionally expressive than White adults on measures of both negative and positive emotions. Similarly, Matsumoto (1993) found that Black students differed from White and Asian American students in their perceptions, attitudes towards, and expressions of discrete negative emotions. Specifically, based on observations of photographs, Black college students perceived the same experience of anger and fear as communicating emotion more intensely than did Asian American students and the same experience of disgust as communicating emotion more intensely than did White and Asian American students. Moreover, Black students were less likely to rate sadness as an appropriate or acceptable emotional expression as compared to White students. Black students also reported expressing anger more frequently than White, Asian American, and Hispanic students. These differences also have appeared in studies of adolescents, with Black high school students being less likely to express feelings of sadness, antipathy, fondness, and pleasure than White high school students (Balkwell, Balswick, & Balkwell, 1978). Thus, initial findings from research including Black participants indicate that culture influences emotional expressions and how individuals perceive and think about emotions.

Third, although we might expect within-group variability and individual differences (Fisher et al., 2002) among Blacks in their reactions toward the expression of emotions, limited research examines how individuals vary from one another. For example, in a sample of predominantly Black adolescents, O’Neal and Magai (2005) found that children’s reports of their parents’ reactions to various emotions differed as a function of age and gender. Thus, the possibility of within-culture variation serves as a final reason to conduct a within-group study.

The current study thus recognizes the importance of cultural influences on emotions and uses a within-culture design to examine the contributors to emotional expression in Black adolescents. Specifically, I used a within-culture design to examine a potentially key contributor to Black adolescents’ attitudes about sadness, namely parental emotion socialization.

### *Parental Emotion Socialization*

Children learn about different emotions and how they are expressed from others through the process of emotion socialization (Halberstadt, 1986). Thus, emotion socialization can be viewed as an explanatory mechanism for how we form attitudes about emotions. Children may experience emotion socialization through involvement in relationships with several different people (e.g., teachers, peers), but because the family environment is typically the first context in which children are exposed to the expression of emotions, parents play a primary role in this process. For this reason, recent research has increasingly focused on the role parents play in their children's emotional development.

Parental emotion socialization (PES) broadly refers to the messages about emotion that parents communicate to their children through such behaviors as their reactions to their

children's emotions, whether and how parents talk about emotions, parents' own expressions of emotions and, according to some, even how parents' exercise control over their children's emotional expressiveness (Berlin & Cassidy, 2003; Eisenberg, Cumberland, & Spinrad, 1998). These parenting behaviors are presumed to reflect parents' "beliefs, goals, and values in regard to their children's experience, expression, and modulation of emotion" (p. 317; Eisenberg et al., 1998). According to Gottman, Katz, and Hooven (1997), parents' beliefs about their own emotions form their meta-emotion philosophy. Gottman et al. have identified emotion-coaching (i.e., the belief that emotions are acceptable and worthy of expression) and emotion-dismissing (i.e., the belief that negative emotions are harmful and that the experience or expression of such emotions should be avoided) as types of meta-emotion philosophies which reflect the kinds of messages parents provide to their children about emotions. As in any socialization process, these messages are then expected to be internalized by children (Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007), forming the foundation for the child's own attitudes and beliefs about emotional experiences and expressions which in turn are posited to impact the child's ability to regulate his or her own emotions (Sheeber et al., 2003) and eventually encounter or avoid emotional dysfunction or symptomatology.

Within this process, healthy emotion socialization has typically been reported based on empirical evidence as an acceptance of both positive and negative emotions, with parents exhibiting significantly more positive emotions (Garner & Spears, 2000) and a moderate level of control of a child's emotional expressiveness (Berlin & Cassidy, 2003). These strategies thus facilitate the expression of emotion in children, and I refer to them collectively as facilitative PES. Children who grow up in families that consistently express both positive and negative emotions tend to exhibit greater social, emotional, and academic competence

(Cassidy, Parke, Butkovsky, & Braungart, 1992; Garner & Power, 1996). On the other hand, invalidation of emotion through parental rejection, punishment, or dismissal has been linked to social, emotional, and behavioral problems (Eisenberg et al., 1999) including social skills deficits, displays of anger and aggression, low levels of constructive coping and popularity, and high levels of avoidant coping and emotional inhibition in childhood (Carson & Parke, 1996; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1994; Eisenberg, Fabes, & Murphy, 1996) as well as thought suppression, depression, and anxiety in adulthood (Krause, Mendelson, & Lynch, 2003). Thus, I refer to these parental reactions to children's emotions collectively as non-facilitative PES.

The dimension of PES that has perhaps received the most attention is how parents respond to children's expressions of emotion. The current study examined parent behavioral reactions to adolescents' expressions of sadness according to the model described by O'Neal and Magai (2005). This model was chosen for use in the current study because O'Neal and Magai validated it with a predominantly Black (70%) sample of young adolescents (aged 11 to 14) in a study which examined parental reactions to the expression of discrete negative emotions including sadness. They based their model on Tomkins' (1963) Affect Theory and an empirically-based set of socialization behaviors reported by Hunziker (1995). Tomkins' theory discusses parental emotion socialization methods that encourage and discourage children's regulation of negative emotions. Based on Tomkins' work, O'Neal and Magai identified five parental reactions to children's emotional expression that serve to socialize children's understanding about emotion. These are termed reward (i.e., parent provides comfort, empathizes, and helps the child solve his problems), punish (i.e., parent discourages a child's emotion expression by showing disapproval and/or mocking child's expression of



emotion), neglect (i.e., parent ignores child's emotion expression or is not available), override (i.e., parent dismisses or distracts child from expressed emotion), and magnify (i.e., parent responds to child's expressed emotion by expressing the same emotion with equal or stronger intensity). These socialization behaviors are consistent with those used in other studies of emotion socialization of children (e.g., Eisenberg et al., 1996; Jones, Eisenberg, Fabes, & MacKinnon, 2002).

Results of factor analyses that address socialization of negative emotions have suggested that reward and override are generally facilitative, supportive strategies and neglect and punish are strategies that are considered inhibitive, unsupportive, and punitive; magnify, however, has operated as a punitive strategy for anger, but not for sadness or fear (Garside, 2004; Klimes-Dougan, Brand, & Garside, 2001). O'Neal and Magai (2005) also found that override was seen as a mix of positive and negative strategies in their study. The current study will focus only on facilitative PES (defined by the reward construct identified by O'Neal & Magai) and non-facilitative PES (defined by the combined punish and neglect constructs defined by O'Neal & Magai) to compare parental reactions to their children's expression of sadness.

#### *PES in Adolescence*

Although greater attention has focused on the emotion socialization process in childhood than in adolescence, available research indicates a consistent picture in adolescent samples. Although adolescents tend to become increasingly less dependent on their parents for support, parents continue to be involved in their children's emotional development (Klimes-Dougan et al., 2006), and PES behaviors continue to predict adjustment during adolescence (e.g., Hersh, 2006). For example, mothers' acceptance of their own or their

adolescents' negative emotions has been associated with lower levels of depressive symptomatology, higher self-esteem, lower physiological arousal, fewer internalizing and externalizing problems, and more positive feelings about academic and athletic competence, social acceptance, and physical appearance in younger adolescents (Katz & Hunter, 2007). These findings are promising and indicate that PES may continue to be an important influence on emotional development into adolescence. However, a better understanding of this process during adolescence will inform us about how to address important concerns that might arise during a period of development that introduces a unique set of risks and challenges (Steinberg & Silk, 2002).

Additionally, existing research on emotion socialization has been largely based on parents' reports of their own socialization behaviors and children's emotional expression and related outcomes. In contrast, the current study examined adolescents' perceptions of their parents' socialization behavior. Having information on the adolescent's perceptions of emotion socialization behaviors will provide another perspective on PES practices, thus significantly contributing to understanding the nature and impact of this socialization process. Self-report measures of emotion socialization have the advantage of ease because it is often difficult to gain access to observational data on actual parental reactions to children's expressions of negative emotions (Eisenberg et al, 1999). Further, children's perceptions of emotion socialization are likely as valuable if not more so than parents' actual strategies in examining how parent behaviors influence child expression of emotion (Harold, Fincham, Osborne, & Conger, 1997; Klimes-Dougan & Zeman, 2007) since child perceptions are often different from parent intent (Hughes, Bachman, Ruble, & Fuligni, 2006), and children will most likely respond to their own perceptions. Finally, self-reports of emotion socialization

provided by older adolescents will be especially advantageous as they are likely more accurate reporters of their own emotions and others' reactions to them than are children and younger adolescents (Denham & Kochanoff, 2002).

### *PES in Black Children and Adolescents*

Despite the importance of culture on emotional development, the existing literature on PES is limited by a focus on samples of White children and adolescents. The emotion socialization that families provide to their children is typically consistent with the values, beliefs, and normative behaviors within their culture (Le et al., 2002; Matsumoto, 1993). Thus, differences in cultural meaning may result in differences in the development of emotional understanding (Smith & Walden, 1998). Furthermore, cultural factors may influence the types of emotions that are supported and discouraged, teaching individuals from various cultures to express emotions in different ways (Consedine & Magai, 2002). Thus, the attitudes, beliefs, goals, and values that parents have about their children's emotional experiences and expressions, the factors driving parental emotion socialization, and how parents respond to children's distress in particular are likely culturally bound.

Although few studies have assessed the influence of emotion socialization within minority samples, patterns consistent with theories of supportive emotion socialization behaviors have been found with Black participants. For example, facilitative maternal reactions to children's emotions predicted constructive emotion regulation (i.e., responses to peer interactions that diminished or alleviated disagreement or conflict) and prosocial behavior in a sample of Black preschoolers (Garner, 2006). Unexpectedly, however, maternal distraction of emotion, a non-supportive socialization behavior, also predicted children's constructive emotion regulation behavior. Because the PES model was developed using

predominantly White samples, socialization behaviors defined as negative within the existing conceptualization may not be defined as such within a Black sample. Further examination of emotion socialization and how it relates to negative emotions, including sadness, is needed to understand how this process operates in an older sample of Black participants.

#### *PES and Attitudes towards Sadness*

According to the differential emotion theory (Izard & Malatesta, 1987), emotions serve distinct functions and are useful for different purposes. For example, sadness is commonly connoted with some degree of vulnerability or passivity (Stearns, 1993). With reference to the existing literature focusing on White samples, Garside and Klimes-Dougan (2002) propose that sadness elicits comfort and positive parenting behavior (i.e., reward) rather than punishment. It is also expected that empathy and tolerance in response to sadness may lead to better child behavioral functioning (Tomkins, 1991).

However, the functions that emotions serve are largely culturally influenced and can differ across groups (e.g., Consedine & Magai, 2002). Some scholars have indicated that the association of sadness with vulnerability varies across ethnic groups (e.g., O'Neal & Magai, 2005), and the expression of sadness is not always expected to elicit positive or supportive parental reactions. This may particularly be the case for Blacks, including parents and their adolescent children. For example, in their study consisting primarily of Black inner city youth, O'Neal and Magai found that, on average, parental reactions of rewarding sadness were more frequent than parental reactions of rewarding other emotions. Moreover, parental reactions of punishing sadness were also more frequent than parental reactions of punishing other emotions.

Since sadness likely functions to communicate a need for nurturance, empathy, and assistance (Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002), the expression of this emotion may be viewed by parents as less adaptive or even harmful in certain situations for Black adolescents. Because Whites tend to have greater privilege and social status than ethnic minorities (Gross & John, 2003), it is likely that, when interacting with majority individuals, members of ethnic minority groups see a benefit in monitoring and controlling the expression of emotions that might make them appear more vulnerable. Thus, as Matsumoto (1993) concluded, a history of oppression and subjugation of Black people may have led to their learning to attribute greater intensity to emotional expressiveness of others and to more frequently express emotions less indicative of vulnerability, such as anger, even when they are not in the presence of members of the majority group.

Similarly, within the nomenclature of PES, Black parents may appear to have harsher or more punitive reactions to their adolescents' expressions of sadness than do White parents. However, Black parents may be acting protectively and simply perceive the expression of sadness as a maladaptive expression of vulnerability and in turn discourage its expression in their adolescents as a way to appear less vulnerable. In this vein, what is traditionally termed punitiveness in the PES literature may be better conceptualized as protective within Black culture. For this reason, parental behaviors perceived by Black adolescents as intended to discourage or inhibit the expression of sadness may be better conceptualized as non-facilitative PES to avoid the connotation that such behaviors are necessarily negative or punitive. Despite the protective intent of these messages, Black adolescents may nonetheless internalize these messages about sadness as discouraging the expression of sadness and, in turn, develop ambivalent or negative attitudes toward the expression of this emotion. To test

this hypothesis, the current study examined the relationship between PES behaviors and attitudes toward sadness among Black adolescents.

### *Impact of Social Context on PES*

Previously, Fivush (1998) identified context as an important factor impacting PES. Although recent research on parental emotion socialization has begun to consider cultural context as it relates to ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status (e.g., Klimes-Dougan et al., 2007) and its influence on PES, there has been no research focused on other social context factors and their impact on PES. In an ethnically diverse sample of college students, Matsumoto (1993) found significant differences between groups (with Caucasian, Black, Asian, and Hispanic participants) in ratings of appropriateness of emotional expression in eight social situations (including being alone, in public, with family members, and with people of higher status). For example, Caucasians rated situations involving casual acquaintances and people of lower status as being more appropriate for emotional expression than Blacks. However, this study did not examine within-group differences (i.e., whether Blacks perceived sadness as more acceptable to express in private versus public settings) or socialization processes that may have contributed to these differences in display rule attitudes (i.e., whether Black parents provide different levels of facilitative and non-facilitative PES for sadness depending on whether it is expressed in private or public).

Because there is no evidence to support differences in PES between these social contexts in the existing literature, these tests should be considered exploratory. However, given the theories on the function of sadness (e.g., emotion that suggests vulnerability and elicits support and comfort from others), I expect that Black adolescents will perceive greater non-facilitative parental reactions for sadness that is expressed in public than in private

contexts. Perhaps, parents intend for greater non-facilitative parental reactions in public to serve as an added means of protection for their children from being seen as vulnerable in such situations. To address this hypothesis, I examined whether adolescents reported receiving different PES depending on whether sadness was expressed in private (i.e., at home) versus in public (i.e., in the presence of others who do not live in the home).

### *PES across Emotions*

Most research focuses on parent reactions to negative emotions in youth more globally with limited research focusing on the PES of discrete emotions. However, available studies do support unique patterns of PES depending on the child's emotional expression (O'Neal & Magai, 2005). The three emotions typically used in these comparisons represent the core emotions relevant to the development of common forms of internalizing (sadness and fear) and externalizing problems (anger; Malatesta & Wilson, 1988; Zahn-Waxler, Klimes-Dougan, & Slattery, 2000).

According to the functionalist perspective on emotion (reviewed by O'Neal & Magai, 2005), a child's expression of fear may elicit comfort and reassurance, similar to sadness, while expressions of anger may elicit parental assistance in solving a frustrating problem. On the other hand, there is evidence suggesting that children are socialized from a very early age to minimize and control their expression of anger (Malatesta & Haviland, 1982). Subsequently, anger seems to be a salient emotion beginning in early adolescence when there is an increase in parent-adolescent conflict (O'Neal & Magai). Perhaps, this helps explain why parents are usually less likely to give positive responses to anger if it is perceived as being directed at the parents and may provoke a similar response in them.

For Black families, cultural perceptions of certain emotions as making children vulnerable to negative consequences from others may also impact PES in response to specific emotions. To examine this hypothesis, I compared PES to three discrete emotions (i.e., sadness, anger, and fear). Because both sadness and fear are associated with showing weakness and creating vulnerability, I expected that Black parents would use similar socialization strategies in response to their children's expression of these two emotions. However, because anger is not as likely to be associated with vulnerability and weakness within Black culture, I expected that Black parents would demonstrate greater non-facilitative reactions to expressions of sadness than anger.

#### *Gender Differences in the PES-attitudes Relation*

Often attitudes about acceptable emotional expression reflect gender differences, with patterns of what is acceptable to express being consistent with the stereotypical roles men and women are often expected to assume across most cultures (Brody & Hall, 1993). For example, the emotions women are expected to display more than men (e.g., sadness, guilt, and fear) are often associated with affiliation, vulnerability, and self-consciousness and are consistent with the tendency for women to have lower social status and power, lower rates of physical aggression, and traditional gender roles (e.g., child caretaking). Greater male anger and pride, on the other hand, are consistent with the male role of competing with others and a tendency to minimize vulnerability in order to maximize success. Thus, these prescribed roles coupled with culturally influenced attitudes that support them, both of which are likely maintained through socialization, help to explain why recent research reflects gender differences in emotional expression.



For example, both male and female adult participants have been found to report that women express sadness more often than men (Hess et al., 2000; Plant, Hyde, Keltner, & Devine, 2000). Similarly, we might expect that if a parent held such attitudes and beliefs they might directly affect how they respond to their son or daughter's expression of certain emotions and how their child thought about and expressed certain emotions. Consistent with this model, empirical findings from samples of preschoolers (Roberts, 1994) and elementary school-aged children (Fuchs & Thelen, 1998) indicate that parents are more likely to discourage the expression of sadness in boys than in girls, but less likely to discourage the expression of anger in boys (Perry, Perry, & Weiss, 1989). Similarly, young adult male participants were found to report more non-supportive parental responses to their expressions of negative emotions, particularly sadness, than women (Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002).

Such findings are consistent with the hypothesis that children internalize these gender-specific parental attitudes, which directly influences the development of their own attitudes towards certain emotions and emotional expression. Also supporting this hypothesis, Balkwell et al. (1978) found that high school girls demonstrated a greater readiness to express fondness, pleasure, and sadness, whereas boys indicated a greater readiness to express antipathy. Zeman and Shipman (1997) found that adolescent boys reported controlling emotions (i.e., sadness and anger) more than girls, expected responses to all emotion that were less understanding and more belittling, and indicated that they would feel better than girls reported they would feel if they did not express their emotions. Based on these findings, I tested whether boys are exposed to greater non-facilitative PES for sadness than are girls, which in part would explain more negative attitudes towards the expression of sadness in boys than in girls.

### *Summary and Study Hypotheses*

In sum, the current study examined, from an older adolescent's perspective, how Black parents socialize their children's expression of sadness. Specifically, the current study tested five hypotheses.

*Hypothesis 1.* Adolescents would perceive greater non-facilitative PES than facilitative PES in reaction to their expression of sadness.

*Hypothesis 2.* Adolescents would perceive greater non-facilitative PES for sadness expressed in public than in private settings.

*Hypothesis 3.* Adolescents would perceive greater non-facilitative PES for sadness than anger and similar non-facilitative PES to their expressions of fear and sadness.

*Hypothesis 4.* Adolescents who reported greater non-facilitative PES to sadness would report more negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness.

*Hypothesis 5.* There would be gender differences in reported socialization behaviors, and PES would mediate the relationship between gender and attitudes toward the expression of sadness. (A) Specifically, boys would report greater exposure to non-facilitative PES behaviors than would girls. (B) PES would serve as an explanatory mechanism for the relationship between gender and attitudes towards sadness in that based on their socialization experiences boys would report greater negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness. In other words, higher non-facilitative PES would mediate the risk for boys to have more negative attitudes about expressing sadness as compared to girls.

These aims are important since most studies of emotion socialization typically do not assess discrete emotions, tend to assess individuals through age 12, and mainly focus on White samples (O'Neal & Magai, 2005). According to the literature which focuses on

cultural differences in emotional expression, some view sadness as an emotion which suggests vulnerability and lower social status and that elicits assistance and empathy from others. Within a cultural perspective, these views are consistent with theories which posit that Black families may discourage the expression of sadness and socialize their children in a way that is protective against the consequences (e.g., appearing more vulnerable in an environment where demonstrating vulnerability is maladaptive and potentially harmful) of expressing this emotion. It is particularly essential to understand how these factors impact Black adolescents and their families since they are continually confronted by a growing number of potential risks, including an increased risk for developing psychopathology (e.g., depression).

## Method

This project followed a two-study design. Study 1 was conducted in the spring of 2008 and consisted of a series of focus groups intended to define the construct of PES within Black families as well as to identify attitudes toward the expression of sadness in this population. Results from this study informed the development of measures to assess each of these constructs. Study 2 was conducted during the summer of 2008 and tested the proposed hypotheses within a sample of older, Black adolescents.

### *Study 1*

#### *Participants*

Participants were undergraduate students recruited from the Psychology Department participant pool, at a large southeastern university. Only students who self-identified their race/ethnicity as Black or African American and who fell within the age range of 18 to 22 were asked to participate. A total of 12 participants, including one male and 11 female participants, took part in three focus groups. Ten additional participants signed up through the online participant pool system to participate in the study, but did not participate for the following reasons: 6 students did not attend the sessions and 4 students did not meet the inclusion criteria (i.e., did not self-identify as Black or African American). This sample had an average age of 19 and contained freshmen (75%), sophomores (17%), and seniors (8%). As a measure of socioeconomic status, participants reported the highest level of education completed by their mother and/or father with results showing a highly educated sample (8% high school graduate, 25% some college or technical school, 17% college graduate, and 50%

graduate or professional school). Additionally, 17% of participants reported living in a single parent household, 33% reported living in the same household as both their mother and father, and 50% reported living with one parent and another adult (i.e., stepparent and/or grandparent) during their teenage years. One participant in the latter group reported living in two different households as a result of parental divorce.

### *Procedures*

Participants were recruited to take part in one of four focus groups, including one all-male and one all-female group. The all-male group was cancelled when no participants were present at the scheduled group start time. Of the three remaining groups, the first two groups consisted of five female participants each, and the final group consisted of two total participants, one female and one male. Prior to attending the group, each participant was informed that they would be asked to respond in a group format to questions pertaining to how people express, react to, and think about certain emotions. Participants also were informed that sessions would be audio and videotaped and later reviewed by the research staff for analyses purposes only.

Procedures for the focus groups followed guidelines outlined by Krueger (1994). Groups were conducted in a reserved room within the Psychology Department, and each group lasted for no longer than 90 minutes. To ensure confidentiality, only the group moderator, one research assistant, and participants were allowed in the room while groups were conducted. Further, the meeting rooms were self-contained with a closed door and a white noise machine placed outside the door. The principal investigator (a Black female) served as the group moderator. Upon entering the room, the group moderator (a) greeted the participants, (b) described the purpose of the study and the reasons for audio and videotaping

the group, and (c) obtained informed consent from all participants. The group moderator then led a group discussion, following a semi-structured interview format. Participants were asked to respond to questions that focused on: (a) adolescents' expression of emotions, particularly sadness, (b) how parents respond to adolescents' expression of sadness, and (c) adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. (See Appendix A for a complete description of focus group instructions and questions.) The moderator asked additional questions only to clarify or better understand issues raised within the group discussion by participants. At the end of the discussion, participants were asked to complete a brief questionnaire (see Appendix B) which provided anonymous demographic information for each participant. The moderator then provided participants with a debriefing handout and addressed any questions that participants had about the study before terminating the group meeting. As part of the participant pool requirements, participants received course credit for their involvement in the study; they also were given pizza and drinks by the research staff as a thank you.

### *Results*

Each focus group session was transcribed and subjected to a thematic analysis (following Krueger, 1994) regarding participants' perspectives on their parents' reactions to their expression of sadness. Transcripts also were analyzed for participants' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. Central themes were identified by two coders (i.e., principal investigator and project committee chair) and used in the modification and development of the survey measures intended for study 2. Specifically, themes identified from responses obtained from focus group participants were used to assist in generating items. Coders identified themes from the participant responses based on several questions (e.g., how do parents respond to children's expressions of sadness; what are attitudes toward the expression

of sadness; do you think there is anything about being Black/African American that impacts how someone reacts to, expresses, or thinks about sadness). Coders used additional questions to define sadness (i.e., what are different words people use to refer to sadness; what does someone do to express his/her feelings of sadness) and to develop instructions (e.g., does context matter) for the measures based on themes identified in participant responses.

Coders independently identified themes before comparing results of analysis. Themes that were frequently noted and appeared consistently across focus groups were selected for use in the survey. A total of 8 initial themes for PES were identified. Five of these reflected those reported in O'Neal and Magai (2005). Items, in addition to those included in the original O'Neal and Magai measure, were then generated to reflect these themes based on participant responses. To ensure that these concepts were conveyed in the survey measure, items were phrased according to terminology used by the participants whenever possible. For example, participant responses included: "My mom always listens" (reward); "Like tell you what you're sad about isn't really that important" (punish); "They like brush it off...or aren't supportive" (neglect); "They'll try to take you out to eat, try to cover it up" (override); and "My mom cries. She'll cry with me if I'm crying" (magnify).

Initially, three new themes emerged from analyses in addition to the original 5 subscales. I labeled them negative talk, self-resolve, and reject. Upon closer review, however, the negative talk items (i.e., "She pushes you to talk about it"; "She lectures you about talking to her"; "She drags it out of you") were deleted a priori because all three items essentially asked the same question with only a change in wording. Items reflecting the reject theme were included in the measure, but were conceptualized further as part of the theme of punishment due to their conceptual similarities. However, the self-resolve scale was

maintained separately. These items represent responses from focus group participants that pertained to parents allowing their adolescents to resolve issues that elicit sadness on their own. An example of such items includes the following: “She gives you some space.” To maintain a reasonable study scope, however, only items that were a priori related to those scales identified as facilitative (i.e., reward) and non-facilitative (i.e., punish and neglect) are further considered in analysis of study 2.

In a second thematic analysis, the following central themes were identified by the coders with respect to adolescent attitudes: vulnerability, shame/privacy, unjustifiable, burden, feminineness, futility, Black strength, and Black anger. The following sample focus group responses were used to generate items within these subscales: “People might think I’m weak” (vulnerability); “Like if I started crying, I’d feel so shameful that I’m crying” (shame/privacy); “I felt like I didn’t have the right to be sad” (unjustifiable); “[You] don’t want to burden anybody else with your problems sometimes” (burden); “That challenges their [Black male] masculinity” (feminineness); “You just back off” (futility); “Like I think if I saw someone crying that normally wouldn’t, I would be like, ‘oh, I thought she was strong’” (Black strength); “You can’t just be sad, it’s like, no you have to be angry about something” (Black anger).

These attitudes themes were conceptualized as reflecting two separate attitudes scales. The first set of themes was identified by coders from the questions about participants’ attitudes toward sadness in general (e.g., what are the attitudes toward the expression of sadness). The second set of themes was identified from questions that asked focus group participants to reflect on how their race/ethnicity might impact attitudes toward sadness. Thus, because these sets of themes are potentially reflective of two different constructs



(general attitudes and race-based attitudes), two separate measures were formed. Appendices C and D include a complete listing of all identified themes and corresponding items for the PES and attitudes measures.

## *Study 2*

### *Participants*

Participants were rising high school seniors who attended an annual university-sponsored, summer recruitment program. The program aims to promote diversity within the university's undergraduate population. Four 2-day sessions are offered each year. Approximately 1,000 total students from across the state participate in the program. Program participants are minority students from historically underserved populations and fall within the top 25% of their classes. Program participants range in age from approximately 16 to 19 years old, and on average about 70% of the participants are female. Participants represent multiple ethnic minority groups including African American, Native American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian American; however, approximately 80 to 90% of total program participants are African American.

As part of the university-sponsored program, participants were assigned by the program staff to a Developmental Session. According to the program, these sessions are intended to guide participants in making decisions about college, majors, and careers; they also cover topics related to relevant issues that students face during their transition to college. Information and materials are presented to students in the form of an interactive activity, such as hands-on experiences, simulations, and small group work or presentations. Approximately 25 to 30 students generally are assigned to each session. The principal investigator developed two Developmental Sessions for all four 2-day programs and led one

session each week; another member of the research staff (i.e., an advanced doctoral student in the clinical psychology program) led the other session. Both were accompanied by a research assistant from the research staff.

One hundred thirty students participated in these Developmental Sessions. Of the participating students, 68% were female with an average age of 17. The reported race/ethnicity of the students was as follows: 67% African American/Black, 9% Asian American/Asian, 5% Caucasian/White, 8% Latino/Hispanic, 3% Native American, 4% Other, and 4% Multiracial.

*Current Sample.* All students were eligible to participate in the Developmental Sessions, but only participants who self-identified their race/ethnicity as Black or African American were included in this study. The final sample consisted of 87 total participants; 68% were female with an average age of 16. As a measure of socioeconomic status, participants reported the highest level of education completed by their mother and/or father with the results again showing a highly educated sample (10% high school graduate, 23% some college or technical school, 43% college graduate, and 23% graduate or professional school). Additionally, 91% of participants reported living in the same household as their mother, whereas 51% reported living with their father. Thirteen percent and 17% reported living with a stepparent or grandparent, respectively. The majority of participants (71%) identified their mother as their primary caregiver. Remaining participants identified their father (6%), a grandparent (5%), or a sibling (1%) as their primary caregiver. Seventeen percent of participants identified multiple caregivers.

### *Procedures*

Sessions were held in a classroom on campus and lasted for one hour total.

Participants were given an overview of the session and asked to complete a survey which would help them reflect on topics that would be discussed during the interactive activity portion of the session. Prior to completion of the survey, participants were told that the session leaders were also members of a research staff and would invite, though not require, them to give their completed, anonymous surveys to the research staff at the end of the session.

A survey was distributed to each participant enclosed in an envelope. Participants completed the survey individually and anonymously during the first 30 minutes of the session. Surveys were coded by number and no names appeared on the actual surveys. At the start of the second half of the session, students were asked to participate in an interactive presentation led by the principal investigator or another member of the project staff. The presentation included a brief discussion on the function of sadness as the primary emotion associated with depression, factors that might impact the risk of depression during the transition to college, and cultural variations in depression. As an introduction to the presentation, the discussion leader again asked the participants to reflect on their responses to the survey questions as they participated in the interactive presentation.

As part of the presentation, the discussion leader highlighted how the survey offers an example of how information is gathered on important issues like depression, how this information can be used to inform our understanding of specific variables and the development of interventions to address them, and why it is essential to gather information from underserved populations that have been historically underrepresented in research. Students again were told that, in keeping with these goals, the survey they completed at the

beginning of the session could be used by the research staff to contribute to our understanding of the aspects of adolescent sadness and depression discussed during the interactive presentation.

Students were given the following three options: (a) to leave their anonymous survey with the research staff to be used as a part of a research study, (b) to dispose of their survey in the trash can made available by the exit door, or (c) to take their survey with them. (One student chose to take the survey.) Regardless of their choice, all students then were given a copy of a demographic information handout to complete anonymously. (These handouts were coded with numbers and were distributed to students in the same order as the survey; consistent with the survey, no names appeared on the handouts.) If a student completed the demographic information handout at that time, enclosed the handout with the survey in the envelope provided, and returned the envelope to the research staff at the close of the session, he or she gave consent implicitly for the research staff to use his or her survey as part of the proposed study. At the close of the session, all students were instructed to enclose the demographic information form in the envelope with the survey regardless of whether they chose to complete it. Students who chose to leave their completed survey packets to be used as part of the research study were instructed to insert the packet into an open slot at the top of a sealed box at the front of the room as they exited. Before students were instructed to leave their seats, regardless of their participation status, they were given a small gift (i.e., souvenir pencil) as part of participating in the Developmental Session and a handout which listed contact information for the study principal investigator, faculty advisor, and IRB.

### *Measures*

All measures were assessed through self-report, and the survey items can be found in Appendices C through H.

*Parental Emotion Socialization of Sadness (PES-sadness)*. PES behaviors were assessed using items taken from the Emotions as a Child Scale (EAC; Magai, 1996; O'Neal & Magai, 2005) as well as additional items written by the investigator to both tap the theme of self-resolve identified in focus groups and to improve scale reliability of the five original O'Neal and Magai subscales. The EAC includes 62 questions that represent each of the following five domains of socialization: reward, punish, neglect, override, and magnify. O'Neal and Magai found internal reliability coefficients ranging from .15 for punish of sad to .70 for reward of sad within an adolescent (aged 11-14) sample of predominantly Black (70%) inner city youth. Vilker (2000) found internal reliability coefficients ranging from .66 for override of sad to .94 for reward of sad within an adult sample. With a modified version of the scale, Klimes-Dougan et al. (2001) found similar internal reliability coefficients among adolescents and young adults as those found by Vilker with the original scale.

Due to the unacceptable to modest reliability estimates evidenced by the original measure, the PES sadness measure was modified by adding additional items based on responses obtained from the study 1 focus groups. The subscales (reward, punish, neglect, override, and magnify) from the existing PES measure were maintained. Twenty-seven new items within the existing subscale structure were added to the original 16-item scale along with 4 new items from the self-resolve subscale that emerged from the focus group analysis. After deleting 4 items that were either unclear or highly redundant as determined by the investigator, project chair, and five research assistants, 43 total items remained. Following the format of the EAC, respondents were instructed to think of times when they felt sad.

They were then asked to report on the behaviors, in general, of their mother or the person they identified as a primary caregiver (e.g., father, stepparent, or grandparent) if that person was not their mother on a 5-point Likert scale (e.g., “not at all like me” to “a lot like me” from the parent version; Magai & O’Neal, 2003).

Because the hypotheses for the current study were intended to examine facilitative and non-facilitative PES, only the reward and combined punish and neglect subscales were used to test the study’s hypotheses and will be referred to as facilitative and non-facilitative PES, respectively. This decision is consistent with previous research and supported by the significant correlation between the punish and neglect subscales ( $r = .46, p < .0001$ ) and similarities in their relationships with the other subscales. Psychometric properties of the final scales are reported after further scale development in the Results section subsequently.

*Parental Emotion Socialization across Emotions (PES-anger, PES-fear).* For the current study, participants also responded to the scales that assessed their parents’ responses to their feelings of anger and fear using the original items from the EAC (O’Neal & Magai, 2005). The same 5-point response scale as for PES-sadness was used for these scales. A total of 4 items formed each reward scale for PES of anger and fear. For consistency in comparisons, items from the punish and neglect subscales were combined (as for PES of sadness) to form non-facilitative PES scales consisting of 6 total items for each emotion, anger and fear. Variables were formed by averaging items within scales. In the current study, all scales demonstrated at least adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .89; M = 3.18, SD = 1.27$  for facilitative PES-anger;  $\alpha = .76; M = 1.75, SD = .84$  for non-facilitative PES-anger;  $\alpha = .87; M = 3.38, SD = 1.17$  for facilitative PES-fear; and  $\alpha = .79; M = 1.48, SD = .73$  for non-facilitative PES-fear).

*Parental Emotion Socialization by Context (PES-home, PES-others).* To assess differences in PES based on context, participants were asked to respond to a subset of the PES-sadness items described above. Due to time limitations for study administration, a subset of 21 items representing all six ECA domains from the newly modified version of the measure was selected randomly for inclusion. Of interest in the current study, a total of 5 items assessed facilitative PES-sadness within public (i.e., in the presence of others who do not live in the participant's household) and private (i.e., at home) contexts, and 4 items assessed non-facilitative (again the combination of the punish and neglect subscales) PES-sadness within these two contexts. Directions and response scales were parallel across the three sets of PES scales (i.e., PES-sadness, PES-fear and anger, and PES-sadness by context). The facilitative PES context scales both demonstrated adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .87$ ;  $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = 1.13$  for facilitative PES-home;  $\alpha = .83$ ;  $M = 3.39$ ,  $SD = 1.04$  for facilitative PES-others). Although non-facilitative PES context scales demonstrated less adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .64$ ;  $M = 1.64$ ,  $SD = .82$  for non-facilitative PES-home;  $\alpha = .64$ ;  $M = 1.58$ ,  $SD = .76$  for non-facilitative PES-others), both scales were significantly correlated with the full non-facilitative PES-sadness scale that is not context-specific (home,  $r = .89$ ,  $p < .0001$ ; others,  $r = .76$ ,  $p < .0001$ ).

*Attitudes toward Expression of Sadness.* A measure was created for the current study to assess adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. Items were based on responses obtained from study 1 focus group participants. Forty-five new items were created based on the 8 total themes identified during the focus group thematic analysis. After deleting 6 items that were either unclear or highly redundant as determined by the investigator, project chair, and 5 research assistants, 39 total items remained. The first set of

items instructs participants to respond based on their thoughts about sadness, whereas the second set of items asks participants to consider how members of their race/ethnicity think about sadness. Thus, because the measures were intended to measure two different constructs, general negative attitudes (30 items) and race-based attitudes (9 items), they represent two separate measures. The measures assessed positive and negative general and race-based attitudes toward the expression of sadness on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). To score, items assessing positive attitudes were reverse scored and averaged with all other items within the scale. Psychometric properties are reported below after further scale development.

*Validity Measures.* The 13-item Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (SMFQ) – Child version (Angold et al., 1995) is a measure of depression and was used as a test of predictive validity for the PES and attitude measures. The SMFQ asks participants to respond to statements assessing depressive symptoms occurring in the past two weeks by marking (0) not true, (1) sometimes true, or (2) true. For the current study, depressive symptoms were assessed for the past 6 months, and depression was operationalized as the mean score of all items. In the current study, the SMFQ demonstrated adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .90$ ;  $M = 0.57$ ,  $SD = 0.45$ ).

Anger expression was examined using the 15-item Pediatric Anger Expression Scale-Third Edition (Haglund et al., 1994). This scale measures the following forms of anger expression: anger turned inward, anger expressed outwardly, and anger control. In the current study, only the anger-out subscale was used as a test of predictive validity for the PES scale. Participants responded by indicating whether the behavior in each item was true of them on a three-point scale ranging from (0) hardly ever to (2) often. Values from all items were



averaged for an overall subscale score. In the current study, the anger-out subscale demonstrated adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .81$ ;  $M = 1.72$ ,  $SD = .53$ ).

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form (Form C; Reynolds, 1982) is a 13-item measure derived from the original (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) 33-item true (1) -- false (0) scale. For the current study, social desirability was used as a measure of divergent validity for the PES and attitudes scales and was operationalized as the mean score of all items. Five items were reversed scored to allow higher scores to indicate a stronger tendency toward portraying oneself positively. In a sample of college students, Crowne and Marlowe found high internal consistency (0.88) and one-month test-retest reliability (0.89). In a predominately Black sample of young women (mean age = 20), Carr, Gilroy, and Sherman (1996) found a reliability of .77 among Black participants. The short form of the original scale demonstrates high convergent validity ( $r = .93$ ) with the full scale. This measure demonstrated modest internal reliability in the current sample ( $\alpha = .68$ ;  $M = .52$ ,  $SD = .22$ ).

The Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (SPPA; Harter, 1988) is a 36-item self-report questionnaire divided into six subscales (scholastic competence, social acceptance, athletic competence, physical appearance, behavioral conduct, and global self-worth). The current study used the social acceptance subscale to assess predictive validity of the PES measures. Within the subscales, two items are presented so as to demonstrate high competence and the other two demonstrate low competence. Specifically, respondents are first asked to choose which of two opposite statements are most like them (e.g., “Some people find it hard to make friends but for other people it’s pretty easy”) and then to indicate whether the statement is “somewhat true” or “really true” for them. Items are scored from 1

to 4, where 1 represents the least adequate self-judgment and 4 represents the most adequate self-judgment. Values from all items for a given subscale can be averaged to determine an overall subscale score. In the original study by Harter with adolescents, the Cronbach's alpha ranged from .77 to .90 for social acceptance. This subscale demonstrated adequate reliability in the current sample ( $\alpha = .71$ ;  $M = 3.19$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ )

*Demographics.* Participants were asked to report their age, gender, and grade level. Participants also were asked to indicate the highest level of education completed by their mother and/or father by marking (0) less than high school, (1) high school graduate, (2) some college or technical school, (3) college graduate, or (4) graduate or professional school. The head of household's level of education is an indicator typically used to define socioeconomic status (SES; White, 1982) and has demonstrated relatively high agreement between child and parent report (Ensminger et al., 2000). Additionally, participants were asked to report on the family structure of the household in which they reside (e.g., who lives in their household, who are their primary caregivers, how long have they lived with them, and what proportion of their time they live with them).

## Results

### *Development of PES-sadness Measure*

Due to the large number of items relative to the sample size, an exploratory factor analysis on the pooled item set was not tenable. However, a series of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) models were performed to refine item sets within subscales. A total of two such analyses were conducted, focusing on the theoretically relevant subscales of reward (tapping facilitative PES) as well as punish and neglect (tapping non-facilitative PES). To determine the number of factors within each subscale, I examined scree plots and eigenvalues in a Principal Components Analysis (PCA) with communalities set to 1.0 (following Loehlin, 2004). After determining dimensionality, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation (using a promax rotation for solutions with more than one factor). I then examined the validity and reliability of the resulting measures.

Results of the PCA indicated that all items on the PES reward scale loaded onto a one-factor solution. Results of the EFA showed that all items loaded significantly on this factor (with factor loadings ranging from .59 to .80) given a standard cutoff of  $> .30$  for factor loadings (Division of Statistics and Scientific Computing Consulting Group, 1995). The resulting Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .93. Thus, the 12 items showed both content validity (in loading on a single dimension) as well as adequate reliability. The final facilitative PES measure was thus derived as the mean of these 12 items ( $M = 3.69$ ,  $SD = .99$ ).

As aforementioned, given the significant correlation between the theorized punish and neglect subscales ( $r = .46, p < .0001$ ) and similarities in their relationships with the other subscales, these subscales were combined for the factor analysis to define one non-facilitative PES measure. PCA results indicated that a two-factor solution fit the data best. However, a two-factor EFA model resulted in a communality greater than 1.0, which suggested that there was insufficient variance among the items. As such, five items (items 2, 25, 28, 38, and 43 in Appendix C) with factor loadings  $\leq .30$  were deleted from the model based on the one-factor solution. The remaining 10 items represented both the neglect and punitive subscales. Results of an additional EFA indicated that all items (10 total) on the refined scale significantly loaded onto a one-factor solution with loadings ranging from .32 to .83. This refined scale also demonstrated adequate internal reliability ( $\alpha = .87; M = 1.64, SD = .79$ ). (Factor loadings for the final set of PES and attitudes items analyzed in this study are listed in Tables 1 and 2. A complete listing of PES items across all scales also is included in Tables 3 and 4.)

### *Development of Attitude Measures*

Prior to conducting factor analysis, I reviewed the distribution of all attitude items. Eight items (items 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 25, 28, and 30 in Appendix D) with limited variability in participants' responses ( $\geq 80\%$  of participant responses across only 2 options) were dropped prior to subsequent analysis because they yielded little information about the intended construct. A series of factor analyses were then performed separately on the scales of general negative attitudes and the negative race-based attitudes towards sadness.

Initial PCA results of the general negative attitudes items indicated that a six-factor solution fit the data best. However, based on EFA results, seven items were deleted from the

model due to low factor loadings (item 8) or cross-loadings (items 1, 7, 12, 24, 26, and 27). The remaining 15 items were subjected to the PCA procedure. Results indicated that a three-factor solution fit the data best. However, a three-factor EFA model resulted in a communality greater than 1.0. As such, five additional items (items 2, 3, 5, 6, and 23) were deleted from the model due to low factor loadings based on the two-factor solution. Further EFA results indicated that all 10 items on the refined scale significantly loaded onto a one-factor solution with loadings ranging from .34 to .72. These remaining items span across 5 of the initially identified subscales (i.e., vulnerability, shame/privacy, unjustifiable, burden, and futility) and represent general negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness. The final scale was derived as the means of these 10 items with higher scores representing more negative attitudes; it demonstrated adequate internal reliability ( $\alpha = .78$ ;  $M = 2.38$ ,  $SD = .58$ ).

The 9 items assessing race-based negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness also were subjected to a series of EFAs. Initial PCA results indicated that a three-factor solution fit the data best. However, based on EFA results, there were too few items remaining to establish 3 separate scales (i.e., factor three was defined by only 2 items). As such, one item (item 7) was dropped from the model due to cross-loading based on the two-factor solution. The remaining 8 items were subjected to the PCA procedure. Results indicated that a two-factor solution fit the data best. However, based on EFA results, one item (item 4) was deleted from the model due to a low factor loading. Final EFA results indicated that all 7 items on the refined scale significantly loaded onto a one-factor solution with loadings ranging from .36 to .77. This refined scale demonstrated adequate internal reliability ( $\alpha = .76$ ). The final negative race-based attitudes measure was thus derived as the mean of these 7 items ( $M = 2.36$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ ).

### *Examining Validity for Measures of PES and Attitudes*

Analyses also were conducted to establish validity for the PES (i.e., PES-sadness, PES-home, and PES-other) and attitudes (i.e., general and race-based) measures. Correlations were estimated and compared among the 3 PES measures, 2 attitudes measures, 3 measures predicted to be associated with PES and attitudes (i.e., SMFQ, AES, and SPPA) and one measure of divergent validity (i.e., Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form). I tested whether these dependent correlations significantly differed from one another (following Fife-Schaw, 2007) to determine whether the variables of interest were more strongly associated with the predictive rather than the divergent validity measure.

For the PES-sadness measure, there were no significant correlations between the PES-sadness measure and any of the measures intended to test predictive or divergent validity.

However, the SMFQ was significantly correlated with the facilitative (PES-home,  $r = -.34, p = .002$ ; PES-others,  $r = -.39, p = .0002$ ) and non-facilitative (PES-home,  $r = .27, p = .01$ ; PES-others,  $r = .30, p = .006$ ) context scales. Importantly, these predictive validity correlations were stronger than those assessing divergent validity with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale: facilitative PES-home ( $t(82) = 2.22, p < .05$ ), facilitative PES-others ( $t(82) = 2.61, p < .05$ ), and non-facilitative PES-others ( $t(82) = -2.20, p < .05$ ).

For the general negative attitudes measure, only the SMFQ was significantly correlated with this measure ( $r = .25, p = .02$ ). Results also indicated that this predictive validity correlation was stronger than the one assessing divergent validity with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ( $t(82) = -2.48, p < .05$ ).

Again, only the SMFQ was significantly correlated with the negative race-based attitudes scale ( $r = .25, p = .02$ ), and this predictive validity correlation was stronger than the one assessing divergent validity with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ( $t(82) = -2.01, p < .05$ ).

As a result, the PES-sadness measures (i.e., facilitative and non-facilitative PES scales) and both attitudes measures demonstrated adequate reliability and content validity. Both attitudes measures demonstrated predictive validity with a measure of depression (SMFQ) and acceptable divergent validity with a measure of social desirability. However, only the PES-context scales (both facilitative and non-facilitative for home and others contexts) demonstrated acceptable predictive and divergent validity, whereas the PES-sadness scales did not show evidence of validity. These results have implications for interpreting study results subsequently.

#### *Hypothesis 1: Frequency of Facilitative versus Non-facilitative PES-sadness*

The first hypothesis proposed that participants would perceive greater non-facilitative PES than facilitative PES (non-facilitative vs. facilitative PES-sadness). Instead, a matched pairs t-test indicated that participants perceived greater facilitative parental reactions than non-facilitative parental reactions to their expressions of sadness ( $t(86) = 11.21, p < .0001; M = 3.69, SD = .99$  for facilitative PES;  $M = 1.64, SD = .79$  for non-facilitative PES).

#### *Hypothesis 2: Frequency of Non-facilitative PES-home versus PES-others*

The second hypothesis proposed that participants would perceive greater non-facilitative PES in public contexts than in private (non-facilitative PES-others versus non-facilitative PES-home). However, a matched pairs t-test indicated no significant differences

in PES based on context ( $t(85) = -1.88, p = .06; M = 1.58, SD = .76$  for non-facilitative PES in public;  $M = 1.64, SD = .82$  for non-facilitative PES in private).

*Hypothesis 3: Frequency of Non-facilitative PES-sadness, PES-fear, and PES-anger*

The third hypothesis proposed that participants would perceive greater non-facilitative parental reactions to sadness than anger and similar non-facilitative parental reactions to their expressions of fear (non-facilitative PES-sadness versus non-facilitative PES-fear and non-facilitative PES-anger). However, a matched pairs t-test indicated that participants perceived greater non-facilitative PES to their expressions of anger than sadness ( $t(84) = -1.98, p = .05; M = 1.64, SD = .79$  for non-facilitative PES of sadness;  $M = 1.75, SD = .84$  for non-facilitative PES of anger). Another matched pairs t-test indicated that participants perceived greater non-facilitative PES reactions to their expressions of sadness than fear ( $t(84) = 2.09, p = .04; M = 1.48, SD = .73$  for non-facilitative PES of fear).

*Hypothesis 4: Relation between Non-facilitative PES-sadness and Attitudes toward Sadness*

The correlation matrix and descriptive statistics for all PES and attitudes variables are presented in Table 5. An examination of the correlations between each predictor variable and general negative attitudes toward sadness indicated no significant correlations between non-facilitative PES and general negative attitudes. However, non-facilitative PES was significantly correlated with negative race-based attitudes toward sadness ( $r = .23, p = .03$ ). Additionally, results indicated no significant correlations between the attitudes or PES variables and the demographics variables.

To more directly test the fourth hypothesis, two hierarchical multivariate regression analyses were used for testing the significance of the relationship between non-facilitative PES and each of the two attitudes towards sadness measures. Specifically, this hypothesis



proposed that adolescents who reported that their parents demonstrated greater non-facilitative emotion socialization behaviors than adolescents who reported exposure to fewer non-facilitative reactions would have more negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness.

Covariates were included in the first step of the analyses. These included gender, age, SES, whether or not the mother and father lived in the same home as the adolescent, and who the adolescent described as his/her primary caregiver. In the second step, non-facilitative PES was added. Examination of skew and kurtosis showed that the distribution of the attitude measures were within tolerable limits of normality. Because ordinary least squares (OLS) estimators are extremely sensitive to outliers (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003), regression diagnostics were performed to measure the extent to which the presence of outliers in the data impacted the outcome of the regression analysis. Measures of influence (DFFITS and DFBETAS) were used to determine which specific cases would be appropriate for further exploration. No case exceeded the cutoff ( $> 1.0$ ) for either measure of influence; thus, none were excluded from the regression analyses.

In the first model predicting general attitudes toward sadness, gender ( $\beta = .07, p = .54$ ), age ( $\beta = .07, p = .53$ ), and SES ( $\beta = .04, p = .70$ ) were not significant predictors of attitudes. Similarly, whether or not the mother ( $\beta = -.03, p = .78$ ) or father ( $\beta = .14, p = .27$ ) lived in the home and the primary caregiver ( $\beta = .07, p = .56$ ) were not significant predictors of attitudes. However, a significant and positive relationship between non-facilitative PES and general negative attitudes towards sadness was found ( $\beta = .23, p = .05$ ). That is, greater non-facilitative PES predicted more general negative attitudes towards sadness, as hypothesized.

In the second model predicting race-based attitudes toward sadness, gender ( $\beta = .06$ ,  $p = .64$ ), age ( $\beta = -.01$ ,  $p = .93$ ), nor SES ( $\beta = -.14$ ,  $p = .23$ ) were significant predictors of attitudes. Similarly, whether or not the mother ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $p = .86$ ) or father ( $\beta = .09$ ,  $p = .43$ ) lived in the home and the primary caregiver ( $\beta = .02$ ,  $p = .89$ ) were not significant predictors of attitude. But again, a significant and positive relationship between non-facilitative PES and race-based attitudes ( $\beta = .27$ ,  $p = .02$ ) was found, in that greater non-facilitative PES predicted more negative race-based attitudes towards sadness, as hypothesized.

#### *Hypothesis 5: Gender Differences in PES and Attitudes*

The final hypothesis stated that there would be gender differences in reported socialization behaviors, and PES would mediate the relationship between gender and attitudes toward the expression of sadness. However, a series of t-tests indicated no significant gender differences in PES of sadness and adolescents' attitudes toward sadness. Specifically, males and females reported similar facilitative PES-sadness ( $t(85) = -.31$ ,  $p = .76$ ;  $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = .84$  for males;  $M = 3.66$ ,  $SD = 1.06$  for females). Males and females also reported similar non-facilitative PES-sadness ( $t(75) = .88$ ,  $p = .38$ ;  $M = 1.54$ ,  $SD = .59$  for males;  $M = 1.68$ ,  $SD = .88$  for females). With regard to attitudes, males and females reported similar general negative attitudes ( $t(82) = -.73$ ,  $p = .47$ ;  $M = 2.43$ ,  $SD = .34$  for males;  $M = 2.36$ ,  $SD = .61$  for females) and race-based attitudes ( $t(83) = -.44$ ,  $p = .66$ ;  $M = 2.40$ ,  $SD = .52$  for males;  $M = 2.35$ ,  $SD = .61$  for females) toward the expression of sadness. The study intended to test the mediational effect of PES on the relationship between gender and attitudes toward sadness using path analysis. However, there is no evidence to support pursuing further analysis of this hypothesis because this t-test analysis found no significant

gender differences in PES of sadness or adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness.

### *Posthoc Analyses*

Given that participants reported overall greater facilitative PES to sadness than non-facilitative PES, the following posthoc analyses were performed. These analyses examined facilitative PES across contexts (PES-home, PES-others), by emotion (PES-sadness, PES-anger, and PES-fear), and in predicting attitudes toward sadness.

*Facilitative PES-sadness across Contexts.* Expanding Hypothesis 2, this analysis examined whether facilitative PES-sadness differed for the home versus others contexts. A matched pairs t-test indicated no significant difference in facilitative PES based on context ( $t(85) = 1.10, p = .27; M = 3.39, SD = 1.04$  for facilitative PES in public ;  $M = 3.47, SD = 1.13$  for facilitative PES in private).

*Facilitative PES by Emotion.* Expanding Hypothesis 3, this set of analyses tested whether levels of facilitative PES differed by type of emotion. A series of matched pairs t-tests indicated significant differences in facilitative PES across emotions. Specifically, participants perceived greater facilitative PES to their expressions of sadness than anger ( $t(84) = 5.67, p < .0001; M = 3.69, SD = .99$  for facilitative PES of sadness;  $M = 3.18, SD = 1.27$  for facilitative PES of anger). Participants also perceived greater facilitative PES reactions to their expressions of sadness than fear ( $t(84) = 3.24, p = .002; M = 3.38, SD = 1.17$  for facilitative PES of fear).

*Facilitative PES-sadness Predicting Attitudes.* Expanding Hypothesis 4, this analysis tested whether Facilitative PES-sadness predicted general and race-based attitudes toward sadness. Again, two hierarchical multivariate regression analyses were performed to test the

significance of the relationship between facilitative PES-sadness and each of the two attitudes towards sadness measures. In the second step of both models, facilitative PES was added to the covariates. In the first model, results indicated a significant, but negative relationship between facilitative PES and general negative attitudes ( $\beta = -.22, p = .05$ ). That is, greater facilitative PES predicted fewer general negative attitudes toward sadness. In the second model, there was not a significant relationship between facilitative PES and negative race-based attitudes ( $\beta = -.19, p = .09$ ).

*Power Analysis.* Because several effects of PES were non-significant, posthoc power analyses were performed to determine if the current sample size provided adequate power to detect an effect. Power analyses were conducted using the G\*Power3 program (Faul, Erdfelder, & Buchner, 2007, 2009). Based on estimates of statistical power for matched pairs t-tests, the current sample size ( $N = 87$ ) was adequate to provide power of at least .80 (.996) to detect a medium ( $\rho = .5$ ) to large ( $\rho = .8$ ) effect, but not a small effect ( $.50; \rho = .2$ ). For a t-test of two independent means, the current sample size provided adequate power (.93) to detect a large effect, but not a small or medium effect (.14 and .58, respectively). Further, the current sample size provided adequate power (.98) for detecting a large effect ( $f^2 = .35$ ) in the regression analyses, though not a small ( $f^2 = .02$ ) or medium ( $f^2 = .15$ ) effect (.11 and .69, respectively).

## Discussion

The current study intended to define parental emotion socialization (PES) in Black families and to examine the influence of PES on adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. Drawing on a developmental psychopathology perspective, I examined this question to better understand a potentially important, culturally influenced factor that may contribute to cultural differences in the expression of sadness within depression. However, prior to understanding such differences, the current study sought to understand how PES works in Black families.

Two aspects of PES, facilitative and non-facilitative, were identified within a sample of Black youth. Facilitative PES refers to behaviors through which parents encourage or support emotional expression through providing comfort and empathy and helping the child to solve problems (as defined by the reward construct identified by O'Neal & Magai, 2005). Non-facilitative PES refers to behaviors through which parents discourage a child's emotional expression by showing disapproval, mocking or ignoring the child's expression of emotion, or being unavailable (as defined by the punish and neglect constructs identified by O'Neal & Magai). These dimensions of PES are closely aligned with the constructs of emotion coaching and dismissing identified in the meta-emotion philosophy outlined by Gottman et al. (1997). The current study extends the definition of these constructs from this philosophy and operationalizations in White youth to understand PES within a Black adolescent sample.

*Defining PES in Black Youth*

This study contributes to the literature through providing a modified version of the EAC (Magai, 1996; O'Neal & Magai, 2005) developed to assess facilitative and non-facilitative PES in Black adolescents specifically. I extended the measure of PES to consider expressions of sadness in general (PES-sadness) as well as expressions of sadness within public (PES-others) and private (PES-home) contexts. Resulting scales demonstrated adequate reliability and content validity. Both the facilitative and non-facilitative PES context scales (PES-home, PES-others) demonstrated predictive validity. More specifically, the PES context scales were more strongly associated with depressive symptoms than they were with a measure of social desirability.

However, neither the facilitative nor non-facilitative PES-sadness scales demonstrated predictive or divergent validity as expected. Most surprising is that there was not a significant correlation between PES of sadness, the primary emotion associated with depression, and depressive symptoms. In previous research, PES generally has been linked to outcomes related to internalizing problems, including depression (Krause et al., 2003). Perhaps, the lack of a significant relationship between PES-sadness and depressive symptoms is related to how participants responded to the SMFQ, a measure of depressive symptoms. Given that some participants did report negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness, a subset of them may have been unwilling or unable to make accurate reports of their experience of depressive symptoms. Information provided by the focus groups may provide additional support for this explanation. Focus group participants indicated that they often felt more comfortable expressing their feelings of sadness when alone and experienced difficulty in discussing those feelings with others. As such, future research should consider alternative

methods (e.g., direct observation, multiple reporters) for assessing depressive symptoms in Black adolescents.

### *How Parents of Black Youth Use PES*

In the current study, I first hypothesized that Black adolescents would perceive greater non-facilitative PES than facilitative PES to their expressions of sadness. In existing literature, non-facilitative PES (typically defined by punitive behaviors) tends to represent non-supportive parental socialization behaviors and has been linked to negative outcomes in emotional, social, and psychological development (e.g., Carson & Parke, 1996; Eisenberg et al., 1999). However, within the re-conceptualization of non-facilitative PES proposed in the current study, behaviors aimed to discourage the expression of sadness were seen as protective rather than punitive or negative.

Despite the proposed hypothesis, results indicated that participants perceived greater facilitative PES than non-facilitative PES to their expressions of sadness. This finding is consistent with previous research which indicates that children's expression of sadness tends to elicit behaviors consistent with facilitative PES (or reward; Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002). It further suggests that parents were accepting of their children's expression of sadness in that parents who held more accepting beliefs about children's negative emotions were less likely to react non-supportively to their children's negative emotional displays (Wong, McElwain, & Halberstadt, 2009). It also contributes new information to what was known about PES in adolescents. Studies have shown that, as children get older and enter early adolescence, parental expectations for emotion regulation increase and adolescents are discouraged from displaying negative emotions (Dix, 1991; Klimes-Dougan, et al., 2007;

O’Neal & Magai, 2005). However, this study provides evidence to suggest that parents continue to demonstrate facilitative PES toward older adolescents.

When comparing PES across emotions, results from the current study found that adolescents perceived greater non-facilitative PES to their expressions of anger than sadness, but greater facilitative PES to their expressions of sadness than both anger and fear. As evidenced in some previous research, parents were more likely to discourage and show greater disapproval toward the child’s expression of anger than sadness (Malatesta & Haviland, 1982). On the other hand, O’Neal & Magai (2005) found that, on average, participants reported reward of sad and punish of sad more than with any of the other emotions assessed in their sample of primarily Black inner city youth. They concluded that, given the high stress, high crime neighborhoods in which their participants resided, parents may have felt that they needed to “toughen up” their children to prevent them from being vulnerable to bullying.

Perhaps, I did not find greater non-facilitative PES than facilitative PES in response to sadness or greater non-facilitative PES in response to sadness than anger within this particular sample due to its limited variability. First, the sample was largely female, and parents are more likely to discourage expression of anger in girls than in boys (reviewed by Zahn-Waxler, 2000). Second, participants were academically successful (from the top 25% of their classes) and from highly educated families with nearly two-thirds of parents (at least one per family) having a college education or beyond. Parent education level has been demonstrated to be a consistent and reliable indicator of SES (White, 1982). Likely, families from higher socioeconomic status levels are not confronted with the same stressors as



families from lower income, higher crime communities and do not perceive the same risks in emotional expression.

Some researchers conclude that children in low-income environments learn to express certain negative emotions as an adaptive strategy to avoid being viewed as vulnerable in the harsher environments in which they grow up (Zeman & Shipman, 1997). For example, research indicates that pre-school children from low-income families receive greater encouragement from their parents for expressions of anger and aggressive behavior, whereas expressions of sadness and vulnerability are seen as less acceptable (Miller & Sperry, 1987). Further, these children tend to demonstrate higher levels of anger (Garner & Spears, 2000) and aggression (Herzberger & Hall, 1993) than sadness. Many of these findings are based on minority samples since minority families are disproportionately prevalent in low-income communities (Smith & Walden, 1998). Consequently, it is difficult to distinguish the ethnic and SES effects within these samples. These findings further underscore the importance of understanding variability in the use of PES among Black families. Future research, with a more socioeconomically diverse sample, should examine whether SES acts as a moderator to explain the relationship between non-facilitative PES and the expression of sadness in some Black families while not others.

Based on comparisons across emotions, results from the current study also provide evidence to support that PES is emotion-specific. That is, the use of PES behaviors by Black parents appears to be particular to the type of emotional expression by their children, showing a nuanced shaping of emotional expression. These findings are consistent with existing research on discrete emotions (e.g., O'Neal & Magai, 2005) and suggest that PES behaviors do not simply represent general parenting practices. To more directly test such a

hypothesis, future research should examine the relationship between PES and parenting styles. Addressing emotion socialization within the broader context of parenting practices also will enhance our understanding of family emotional processes (Klimes-Dougan & Zeman, 2007).

In the current study, I also expected to find differences in how parents used PES across contexts (i.e., at home and in the presence of others). However, results indicated no differences in facilitative or non-facilitative PES across contexts. Socialization behaviors are believed to represent parents' underlying beliefs and philosophies about emotions and emotional expression (Eisenberg et al., 1998). Taking this into account in conjunction with the current study results, we might expect that parents' emotion socialization behaviors would be consistent across contexts. On the other hand, perhaps I did not capture the central contexts that reflect differences in PES of sadness. For example, Matsumoto (1993) identified several specific social situations, including with close friends and family members, casual acquaintances, people with a higher/lower status, or children. Such specific social situations may have a greater influence on PES than more general social contexts similar to those assessed in the current study. Additionally, participant responses from the focus groups indicated that what someone is sad about, not just where or with whom they express their sadness, matters. Specifically, they expected that their parents would respond differently to their expression of sadness if they were sad over a breakup with a boyfriend/girlfriend versus the death of a family member or pet. As such, future research should consider other situational and more specific social contexts.

*Contribution of PES to Understanding Attitudes*

The current study contributes to the literature by examining direct effects of PES on adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness. Additionally, this study provides measures developed to assess general negative attitudes and race-based attitudes toward the expression of sadness in Black adolescents. The attitudes measures reflect how adolescents generally think about sadness and consider how their race/ethnicity influences attitudes toward sadness. Although there are scales that assess parents' attitudes and beliefs about sadness (Halberstadt et al., 2006), currently there are no such measures intended for children or adolescents. In this study, these scales demonstrated adequate reliability, content validity, and predictive validity with the SMFQ. They also demonstrated acceptable divergent validity with a measure of social desirability. Additional research is needed for continued development and validation of these measures.

Based on study results, we now know that there is a direct relationship between PES of sadness and attitudes toward the expression of sadness. As hypothesized, greater non-facilitative PES predicted greater negative general and race-based attitudes toward the expression of sadness, while greater facilitative PES predicted fewer general negative attitudes toward the expression of sadness. These findings are consistent with the models of socialization and attitude development which posit that messages that adolescents perceived through their parents' reactions to their expression of sadness become internalized (Klimes-Dougan & Zeman, 2007) and directly contribute to the development of their attitudes toward sadness. These findings also support the literature that proposes that PES significantly influences not only how children express emotions (Le et al., 2002), but also how they think about emotional expression in general.

The relationship between non-facilitative PES and race-based attitudes also suggests a significant influence of culture on PES and attitudes toward sadness. Perhaps, the influence relates to racial identity and what it means to be Black for some youth. Racial identity has been conceptualized as the significance and meaning Black individuals place on race and being Black (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997). During the measure development phase, themes related to being strong and expressing anger, instead of sadness, emerged when focus group participants were asked if there is anything about being Black/African American that impacts how someone reacts to, expresses, or thinks about sadness. Based on these responses, perhaps some adolescents perceive demonstrations of discouraging or non-facilitative PES to their expressions of sadness to mean that expressing this emotion contradicts the way they identify themselves as strong Black people, for example. Thus, those who consider race to be a core aspect of their identity would likely develop negative attitudes toward the expression of this emotion.

As aforementioned, study results supported a significant relation between PES-sadness within each context, as well as attitudes, and the SMFQ. Thus, while I did not directly test the relation between PES and depression, this pattern of correlations is consistent with the possibility that attitudes, both general negative and race-based attitudes, mediate the relation between context-specific PES-sadness and depressive symptoms. This relation follows the model, informed by a developmental psychopathology perspective, which motivated this study.

With regard to attitudes and gender, I expected that boys would perceive greater non-facilitative PES, which also would contribute to them having greater negative attitudes. Despite the proposed hypothesis, there were no gender differences in PES or attitudes toward

sadness. This finding was unexpected given the breadth of literature that supports gender differences in emotion socialization and expectations for emotional expression (e.g., Garside & Klimes-Dougan, 2002; Perry et al., 1989; Zeman & Shipman, 1997). Perhaps, these findings present a different pattern of emotion socialization and expectations for Black youth in that expression of sadness is treated similarly across genders. On the other hand, the PES measures emerged from focus groups consisting mostly of female participants, with only one male participant. Perhaps, the identified constructs did not fully capture PES for both females and males, which may have prevented the emergence of gender differences in the current study. Further, much of the existing research that examines gender differences also looks at parent gender and has found that fathers are often more punitive to their children's displays of emotions (Eisenberg et al., 1996), particularly sons. Thus, gender differences in PES among adolescents may have emerged depending on parent gender. In the current study, participants were asked to report on PES based on the person(s) they identified as their primary caregiver. The majority of participants identified their mother (71%) as a primary caregiver, whereas only 6% identified their father. Future research would likely benefit from asking participants to report on PES for both parents to be able to directly assess potential differences.

### *Conclusions*

The current study provided a framework for identifying PES of sadness in Black families. It also focused on a sample of older adolescents, whereas limited focus has been made on either of these groups in the existing emotion socialization literature. Reducing this gap in the literature is important given that parental support is especially needed during adolescence due to the challenges they face regarding regulating negative emotions,

managing emotional liability, and increased risk for psychopathology (e.g., Greene, 1990; Larson, et al., 1996). This study did not support that non-facilitative PES is used as a protective mechanism, but demonstrated how parents use both facilitative and non-facilitative behaviors as emotion-specific PES strategies.

Although no specific variables were identified to explain within-group differences, this study also provided an example of the valuable information that can be obtained from a within-group design. For example, it made a contribution to measure development, particularly in assessing attitudes toward a discrete emotion (sadness), within an underrepresented minority sample. It also identified the contribution of PES to understanding adolescents' attitudes toward the expression of sadness.

Results from this study should be considered in light of the following limitations, each suggesting directions for future research. First, a limitation to both studies 1 and 2 was the limited variability among participants and small sample sizes. Given the makeup of the focus groups, the measures had a limited male perspective and may not have included perspectives influenced by lower socioeconomic statuses. This may limit generalizability of the measures for use with a more diverse Black family population.

Multiple themes pertaining to PES of sadness and attitudes toward sadness emerged from the study 1 focus groups. Due to the large number of items relative to the sample size, an exploratory factor analysis on the pooled item set was not tenable. As such, the indicators for PES-sadness and attitudes are culturally relevant because they were developed within this population; however, I cannot comment on the structure of these models without a factor analysis including all items. Despite these limitations, this research may inform development

of a theoretical model of PES specifically for Black families, which should consider additional domains (e.g., self-resolve).

Posthoc power analyses indicated that the current sample size only provided adequate power to detect large effects for the study 2 hypotheses that tested gender differences and the relationship between PES and attitudes. Thus, a small to medium effect between genders or within the relationship between facilitative PES and race-based attitudes would not have been detected within the given sample. Future research should utilize a larger, more diverse sample for measurement development and hypothesis testing.

Second, this study did not assess participants' history of sadness expression. Specifically, study 2 did not ask how often or in what ways adolescents express sadness though behaviors for operationalizing sadness were identified from study 1 focus group participants. According to the literature, it appears that parents try to provide a non-reinforcing environment when sadness is expressed in non-constructive ways (Cassano & Perry-Parrish, 2007). Thus, if we had information available to suggest that these adolescents were particularly skillful in expressing emotions constructively, then we would expect that their parents would have been more likely to be supportive of their expression of sadness. This study also did not assess parent-child relationships which may have contributed to our understanding of parents' reactions, considering that by middle childhood and adolescence the history of the parent-child relationship is very relevant to children's emotional repertoires (Klimes-Dougan & Zeman, 2007).

Third, although this study provides important information about the relationship between PES and attitudes, it does not provide information on how attitudes may affect adolescent outcomes (e.g., how willing/able are children to express emotion depending on

their attitudes) above and beyond the effects of PES. This is an important next step in future research to help us understand attitudes.

As a final limitation, the scales comparing PES across emotions (facilitative and non-facilitative PES-sadness, PES-anger, and PES-fear) did not have parallel items. Based on the primary aims of this study, I only developed one set of scales (PES-sadness); the items on the other scales were taken directly from O'Neal & Magai (2005). One potential benefit, however, is that it may be necessary to have different items across scales to capture various reactions to different emotions. Future research utilizing parallel items across emotion-specific scales would provide additional information on ways to adequately compare PES across emotions.

In identifying specific aspects of PES of sadness in older Black adolescents, this study can inform the development of a PES model specific to this population. It also highlights the importance of examining socialization processes, while considering the influence of cultural factors (e.g., ethnicity and SES), within other groups currently underrepresented in the literature. There are no known theories on how parents' reactions to adolescents' expression of sadness, specifically, impact the manifestation of sadness-related symptoms in depression. Although this study did not examine the manifestation of sadness-related depressive symptoms directly, it provides evidence to support that, through PES, parents significantly influence attitudes toward sadness. With continued measurement development, we will be better able to understand this relationship and how together, PES and attitudes, impact adolescent outcomes, particularly as they relate to the experience and expression of sadness within depression. Future research can expand on these areas to



examine attitudes toward other emotions, including positive emotions, and attitudes' contribution to understanding overall emotional development.

Table 1

*Factor Loadings for Final PES Scales*

Subscale	Item	Factor Loading
Facilitative PES	She comforts you.	.80155
	She asks you what's wrong.	.71119
	She asks you about it.	.75447
	She tries to relate to you.	.71025
	She tells you to talk to her about it.	.59429
	She tries to reassure you by telling you it's ok.	.73864
	She says something encouraging.	.78374
	She understands why you are sad.	.76984
	She helps you deal with the issue.	.79694
	She tells you about something similar that happened to her.	.65734
	She empathizes with you.	.77460
	She is there to listen.	.75585
Non-facilitative PES	She tells you to grow up.	.48160
	She gives you a disgusted look.	.71926
	She brushes you off.	.31788
	She usually doesn't notice.	.78149
	She is not open to talking about your problems.	.77974
	She ignores you.	.70723
	She calls you a crybaby.	.60117
	She usually is not around.	.83479
	She blames you.	.42560
	She says nothing.	.68317

Table 2

*Factor Loadings for Final Attitudes Scales*

Subscale	Item	Factor Loading
General Negative Attitudes	I have a hard time understanding why I should put up with being sad.	.44093
	If I show I am sad around others, I don't think I will get on their nerves. <sup>a</sup>	.42620
	If I admit to being sad, people might think I'm weak.	.42141
	When I feel sad, I have to learn to deal with it myself.	.47347
	I don't necessarily associate crying with weakness. <sup>a</sup>	.34468
	If I cry, others will still want to be around me. <sup>a</sup>	.37417
	I have too much pride to be sad in public.	.69773
	I see nothing wrong with crying in public. <sup>a</sup>	.72439
	If others see me sad, they will think I'm an easy target.	.58573
	When I find myself feeling sad, I think I will need to suck it up.	.64263
Negative Race-based Attitudes	Being sad clashes with being a strong, independent Black person.	.76833
	Black people cannot just be sad, they also must be angry.	.55305
	As a Black person, it's ok to cry when you're angry. <sup>a</sup>	.35555
	If a Black person expresses too much sadness, they seem weak.	.66028
	Black people often come off as being mad when they're sad.	.36245
	Black people don't cry because they are supposed to be strong.	.56073
	Crying is unacceptable among Black people.	.67162

<sup>a</sup>Reverse scored items

Table 3

## Study2 PES Items

	PES-Sadness Fac	PES-Sadness Nonfac	PES-Sadness Fac (Home/Other)	PES-Sadness Nonfac (Home/Other)
She comforts you.	√			
She asks you what's wrong.	√			
She asks you about it.	√			
She tries to relate to you.	√			
She tells you to talk to her about it.	√			
She tries to reassure you by telling you it's ok.	√			
She says something encouraging.	√			
She understands why you are sad.	√		√	
She helps you deal with the issue.	√		√	
She tells you about something similar that happened to her.	√		√	
She empathizes with you.	√		√	
She is there to listen.	√		√	
She tells you to grow up.		√		
She gives you a disgusted look.		√		
She brushes you off.		√		
She usually doesn't notice.		√		
She is not open to talking about your problems.		√		
She ignores you.		√		
She calls you a crybaby.		√		√
She usually is not around.		√		√
She blames you.		√		√
She says nothing.		√		√

Table 4

*Study 2 PES Items across Emotions*

Strategy	Sad	Anger	Fear
Reward/ Facilitative	She asks you what's wrong. She understands why you are sad. <sup>a</sup> She comforts you. <sup>a</sup> She helps you deal with the issue. <sup>a</sup> She asks you about it. <sup>a</sup> She tries to reassure you by telling you it's ok. She says something encouraging. She tries to relate to you. She tells you to talk to her about it. She tells you about something similar that happened to her. She empathizes with you. She is there to listen.	She finds out what makes you angry. She understands why you feel angry. She talks it out with you. She helps you deal with the problem.	She asks you what's wrong. She helps you deal with the situation. She holds you. She helps you deal with the problem.
Punish/ Non-Facilitative	She tells you to grow up. She calls you a crybaby. <sup>a</sup> She gives you a disgusted look. <sup>a</sup> She blames you.	She tells you that you are bad. She punishes you. She says you should be ashamed.	She tells you to grow up. She punishes you. She makes fun of you.
Neglect/ Non-Facilitative	She usually is not around. <sup>a</sup> She usually doesn't notice. <sup>a</sup> She ignores you. <sup>a</sup> She is not open to talking about your problems. She brushes you off. She says nothing.	She usually is not around. Most times she does not notice. She ignores you.	She usually is not around. She doesn't notice. She ignores you.

Note. Items in column 1 include items from the Emotions as a Child Scale (EAS; O'Neal & Magai, 2005) and items created for this study, whereas all items in columns 2 and 3 were taken directly from the EAS.

<sup>a</sup>Items from the EAS scale.

Table 5

*Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics for Final PES and Attitudes Scales*

Variable	PES-S Fac	PES-S Nonfac	PES-S Fac (Home)	Pes-S Nonfac (Home)	PES-S Fac (Other)	PES-S Nonfac (Other)	PES-A Fac	PES-A Nonfac	PES-F Fac	PES-F Nonfac	Attitudes	Race- based Attitudes
PES-Sadness Fac	1.00											
PES-Sadness Nonfac	-.83**	1.00										
PES-Sadness Fac (Home)	.92**	-.78**	1.00									
PES-Sadness Nonfac (Home)	-.79**	.89**	-.77**	1.00								
PES-Sadness Fac (Other)	.80**	-.61**	.81**	-.62**	1.00							
PES-Sadness Nonfac (Other)	-.69**	.77**	-.70**	.94**	-.59**	1.00						
PES-Anger Fac	.75**	-.66**	.74**	-.62**	.68**	-.55**	1.00					
PES-Anger Nonfac	-.73**	.81**	-.75**	.75**	-.62**	.70**	-.61**	1.00				
PES-Fear Fac	.69**	-.66**	.68**	-.58**	.52**	-.51**	.70**	-.56**	1.00			
PES-Fear Nonfac	-.64**	.68**	-.68**	.74**	-.44**	.69**	-.51**	.70**	-.51**	1.00		
Attitudes	-.21	.19	-.24*	.21	-.23*	.19	-.13	.20	-.13	.21	1.00	
Race-based Attitudes	-.18	.23*	-.18	.22*	-.21*	.18	-.02	.21	-.07	.18	.59**	1.00
Mean	3.69	1.64	3.47	1.64	3.39	1.58	3.18	1.75	3.38	1.48	2.38	2.36
Standard Deviation	.99	.79	1.13	.82	1.04	.76	1.27	.84	1.17	.73	.53	.58
Cronbach's Alpha	.93	.87	.87	.64	.83	.64	.89	.76	.87	.79	.78	.76

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .001$ .

Table 6

*Divergent and Predictive Validity and Descriptive Statistics*

Variable	SMFQ	AES	SPPA	MCSDS
PES-Sadness Facilitative	-.21	-.11	.02	.03
PES-Sadness Non-facilitative	.20	.06	.02	.02
PES-Sadness Facilitative (Home)	-.34*	-.10	.06	.05
PES-Sadness Non-facilitative (Home)	.27*	.11	-.05	-.05
PES-Sadness Facilitative (Other)	-.39**	-.19	.16	.06
PES-Sadness Nonfacilitative (Other)	.30*	.13	-.08	-.09
Attitudes	.25*	.04	-.28*	-.19
Race-based Attitudes	.25*	.10	.02	-.11
Mean	.57	1.72	3.19	.52
Standard Deviation	.45	.53	.67	.22
Cronbach's Alpha	.90	.81	.71	.68

Note. The SPPA was not included in the matrix with the other measures because of significant effects on the correlation results due to missing data (18 cases).

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .001$ .

## Appendix A

### Semi-structured Interview for Focus Groups with College Students

**Instructions to group leader:** Open the group session by explaining the purpose of the group and obtaining written consent from each participant before beginning. Stress confidentiality of responses and the importance of hearing each participant's opinions and ideas. Emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers and that we are trying to gather as many opinions as possible. Bold questions are those that are of primary interest in the study and bulleted questions provide potential probes that may be used as needed to elicit related answers from the participants. Begin the discussion by asking each group member to provide their first name only and to briefly explain how they heard about the group and why they decided to participate. As an icebreaker, ask each participant to respond to the following prompt: Imagine that you could meet one famous person/celebrity. Who would you want to meet and why?

Questions and probes:

As you respond to the following questions, try to think like a teen living at home.

1. What are different words people use to refer to sadness? For example, someone might say I feel down or bummed.
  - Help me understand the difference between these?
2. What does someone do to express his/her feeling of sadness?
  - How can you tell when another person is sad?
  - Is this different for males and females?
3. Does how someone expresses sadness change when he/she is alone vs. with someone else?
  - Does it matter who the other person is (parent vs. friend, male vs. female)?
4. Remember to try to think like a teen living at home. What would a teen's parent do if he/she expressed sadness?
  - Would it matter how the teen expressed sadness?
  - Does it matter what you are sad about?
  - Which of these parent's behaviors do you think would discourage the teen from expressing sadness the next time he/she felt it?
5. Imagine that a person saw his/her friend crying over a recent break-up with a boyfriend/girlfriend? What would that person think about his/her friend?
  - What if the friend were crying over the recent death of a family member? Would that person's thoughts about the friend change?
  - Does the friend's expression of sadness say anything about him/her?
  - Does it matter what the friend is sad about?
  - Would it matter how the friend expressed his/her feeling of sadness?
  - Does it matter if the friend is male or female?
  - What do people think in general when they see another person's expression of sadness?
6. We've been talking about sadness, how it is expressed, and what people think about it. Do you think that there is anything about being African American/Black that impacts how someone reacts to, expresses, or thinks about sadness?
7. Now, let's choose a different emotion. What are different words people use to refer to anger? What about fear?
8. What does someone do to express his/her feelings of anger? What about fear?



## Appendix B

### Demographics Questionnaire (Study 1)

Please respond to the following questions by marking with an **X** the response that most accurately describes you.

1. What is your gender?
  - ☐ Female
  - ☐ Male
2. How old are you?
  - ☐ 18
  - ☐ 19
  - ☐ 20
  - ☐ 21
  - ☐ 22
3. Which of the following best describes your current classification?
  - ☐ Freshman
  - ☐ Sophomore
  - ☐ Junior
  - ☐ Senior
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is the highest level of education your mother has completed?
  - ☐ Less than high school
  - ☐ High school graduate
  - ☐ Some college or technical school
  - ☐ College graduate
  - ☐ Graduate or professional school
  - ☐ Don't know
5. What is the highest level of education your father has completed?
  - ☐ Less than high school
  - ☐ High school graduate
  - ☐ Some college or technical school
  - ☐ College graduate
  - ☐ Graduate or professional school
  - ☐ Don't know
6. When you were a teenager, who lived in your household?
  - ☐ Mother
  - ☐ Father
  - ☐ Stepparent
  - ☐ Grandparent
  - ☐ Siblings
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Which of the following best describes you?
  - ☐ Black or African American
  - ☐ Multi-racial. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C

### Measure Development for PES Scales

Themes	Items	Sample Focus Group Quotes
Reward (parent provides comfort, empathizes, helps child solve problems)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. She asks you about it.</li> <li>26. She understands why you are sad.</li> <li>4. She comforts you.</li> <li>27. She helps you deal with the issue.</li> <li>13. She tells you to talk to her about it.</li> <li>5. She asks you what's wrong.</li> <li>42. She is there to listen.</li> <li>10. She tries to relate to you.</li> <li>35. She empathizes with you.</li> <li>29. She tells you about something similar that happened to her.</li> <li>16. She tries to reassure you by telling you it's ok.</li> <li>20. She says something encouraging.</li> </ul>	"My mom always listens."
Punish (parent discourages child's emotional expression by showing disapproval/mocking the child)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24. She calls you a crybaby.</li> <li>38. She shows she does NOT like your being sad.</li> <li>12. She gives you a disgusted look.</li> <li>2. She tells you what you're sad about isn't really that important.</li> <li>28. She says you should never cry.</li> <li>25. She shows it's ok to be angry, but not sad.</li> <li>1. She tells you to grow up.</li> <li>43. She tells you to just stop being sad.</li> <li>33. She blames you.</li> </ul>	"Like tell you what you're sad about isn't really that important."
Neglect (parent ignores child or is not available)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31. She usually is not around.</li> <li>15. She usually doesn't notice.</li> <li>21. She ignores you.</li> <li>19. She is not open to talking about your problems.</li> <li>14. She brushes you off.</li> <li>39. She says nothing.</li> </ul>	"They like brush it off...or aren't supportive."

Themes	Items	Sample Focus Group Quotes
Override (parent silences expressed emotion by dismissing/distracting)	36. She tells you not to worry. 22. She jokes with you about it. 9. She tells you to cheer up. 17. She buys you something you like. 3. She says you can deal with it. 8. She says you have nothing to worry about. 18. She offers to take you out somewhere.	“They’ll try to take you out to eat, try to cover it up.”
Magnify (parent expresses emotion with equal or stronger intensity)	32. She gets sad, too. 11. She gets all upset. 23. She cries with you. 30. She seems sad, too. 37. She gets sad with you.	“My mom cries. She’ll cry with me if I’m crying.”
Self-resolve (parent allows child to resolve the issue on his/her own)	34. She lets you deal with the problem by yourself. 40. She gives you some space. 41. She allows you to build yourself up by dealing with the issue on your own. 7. She prepares you for ‘the real world’ by being hands off.	“She gives you some space.”

Note. Facilitative (i.e., Reward) and non-facilitative (i.e., Punish and Neglect) scales are highlighted.

## Appendix D

### Measure Development for Attitudes Scales

Themes	Items	Sample Focus Group Quotes
Vulnerability (expressing sadness leads to appearing weak/vulnerable)	14. I don't necessarily associate crying with weakness. <sup>a</sup> 12. I don't think I seem vulnerable when I show my sadness. <sup>a</sup> 11. If I admit to being sad, people might think I'm weak. 22. If others see me sad, they will think I'm an easy target. 30. My parents don't want me to show sadness because I'll seem soft.	"People might think I'm weak."
Shame/Privacy (expressing sadness is shameful/private)	25. I think it's ok to show my sadness in front of others. <sup>a</sup> 21. I see nothing wrong with crying in public. <sup>a</sup> 9. I have too much pride to be sad in public. 27. I feel ashamed when I cry. 13. When I feel sad, I have to learn to deal with it myself.	"Like if I started crying, I'd feel so shameful that I'm crying."
Unjustifiable (expressing sadness is not justifiable)	20. I have the right to be sad. <sup>a</sup> 8. I think I need to have a real reason to be upset. 3. I shouldn't be sad because others have it worse. 18. It's ok to be sad. <sup>a</sup> 29. When I find myself feeling sad, I think I need to suck it up.	"I felt like I didn't have the right to be sad."

Themes	Items	Sample Focus Group Quotes
Burden (expressing sadness makes you a burden to others)	26. I don't show that I'm sad because I don't want to burden anyone with my problems. 5. If I show that I am sad, I might bring someone else down, too. 15. If I cry, others will still want to be around me. <sup>a</sup> 9. If I show that I am sad around others, I don't think that I will get on their nerves. <sup>a</sup> 23. If I seem sad, I might pressure someone else into feeling sad.	"[You] don't want to burden anybody else with your problems sometimes."
Feminineness (expressing sadness is more acceptable for girls/women)	10. It's ok for girls to cry, but it's different for guys. 28. When guys show sadness, that makes them less of a man. 1. I think showing sadness challenges masculinity. 6. I don't think it's harder for guys than girls to express sadness. <sup>a</sup> 2. I don't think that showing sadness makes guys seem less strong. <sup>a</sup>	"That challenges their [Black male] masculinity."
Futility (there is nothing you can do for someone who expresses sadness)	7. I don't express my sadness because there is no point. 16. There's nothing anyone can do for me when I feel sad. 24. When others see me sad, I don't think they should just back off. <sup>a</sup> 4. I have a hard time understanding why I should put up with being sad. 17. I think it helps to express my sadness. <sup>a</sup>	"You just back off."

Themes	Items	Sample Focus Group Quotes
Black Strength (expressing sadness contradicts belief that Black people should be strong)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Black people don't cry because they are supposed to be strong.</li> <li>1. Being sad clashes with being a strong, independent Black person.</li> <li>9. Crying is unacceptable among Black people.</li> <li>7. Black people have a legacy of being strong and not showing sadness.</li> <li>5. If a Black person expresses too much sadness, they seem weak.</li> </ul>	<p>"Like I think if I saw someone crying that normally wouldn't, I would be like, 'oh, I thought she was strong.'"</p>
Black Anger (expressing sadness contradicts belief that Black people are angry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Black people cannot just be sad, they must also be angry.</li> <li>6. Black people often come off as being mad when they're sad.</li> <li>4. In our culture Black people are usually portrayed as angry, not sad.</li> <li>3. As a Black person, it's ok to cry when you're angry.<sup>a</sup></li> </ul>	<p>"You can't just be sad, it's like, no you have to be angry about something."</p>

<sup>a</sup>Reverse scored items

## Appendix E

### Anger Expression Scale

**The following are statements that teens use to describe themselves when they feel angry. Read each statement carefully and decide if it is hardly ever true, or sometimes true, or often true for you. There are no right or wrong answers.**

1. I show my anger.
2. I do things like slam doors.
3. I attack whatever it is that makes me feel very angry.
4. I say mean things.
5. I lose my temper.

## Appendix F

### Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form

**The next questions ask about what you are like as a person. Please answer the following questions as true if the statement describes you and as false if the statement is not at all like you. Please circle your response.**

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
5. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
7. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.



## Appendix G

### Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents

**The next questions talk about two kinds of people, and we want to know which people are most like you. Decide if you are more like the people on the left side or the people on the right side of each question. Then decide whether that side is only sort of true of you or really true of you. Choose your answers accordingly.**

1. Some people find it hard to make friends but for other people it's pretty easy
2. Some people have a lot of friends but other people don't have very many friends
3. Some people are kind of hard to like but other people are really easy to like
4. Some people are popular with others their age but other people are not very popular
5. Some people feel that they are socially accepted but other people wished that more people their age accepted them

## Appendix H

### Demographics Questionnaire (Study 2)

**The following questions are about you. Please take your time and read each question carefully. Mark your answer for each question by putting an X in the ☐ next to the answer that best describes you. If you have a question, ask a member of the project staff. Thank you for your participation!**

1. What is your gender?
  - ☐ Female
  - ☐ Male
2. How old are you?
  - ☐ 15
  - ☐ 16
  - ☐ 17
  - ☐ 18
  - ☐ 19 or older
3. Which of the following best describes you? Check all that apply.
  - ☐ African American or Black
  - ☐ Asian American or Asian
  - ☐ Caucasian or White
  - ☐ Latino or Hispanic
  - ☐ Native American
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
4. If you consider yourself to be multiracial, is there a racial/ethnic group for which you more closely identify?
  - ☐ No, I identify with both/all equally
  - ☐ African American or Black
  - ☐ Asian American or Asian
  - ☐ Caucasian or White
  - ☐ Latino or Hispanic
  - ☐ Native American
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
5. What is the highest level of education your mother has completed?
  - ☐ Less than high school
  - ☐ High school graduate
  - ☐ Some college or technical school
  - ☐ College graduate
  - ☐ Graduate or professional school
  - ☐ Don't know
6. What is the highest level of education your father has completed?
  - ☐ Less than high school
  - ☐ High school graduate
  - ☐ Some college or technical school
  - ☐ College graduate
  - ☐ Graduate or professional school
  - ☐ Don't know

7. Who lives in your household? Check all that apply.
- ☐ Mother
  - ☐ Father
  - ☐ Stepparent
  - ☐ Grandparent
  - ☐ Sibling(s)
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Which of these individuals would you describe as your primary caregiver?
- ☐ Mother
  - ☐ Father
  - ☐ Stepparent
  - ☐ Grandparent
  - ☐ Sibling(s)
  - ☐ Other. Describe: \_\_\_\_\_
9. How many years have you lived with this person?
- ☐ Less than 5
  - ☐ 5-10
  - ☐ 10-15
  - ☐ More than 15
10. How many days per week do you live with this person?
- ☐ 1-2 days
  - ☐ 3-4 days
  - ☐ 5-6 days
  - ☐ 7 days

## References

- Alloy, L. B. (2001). The developmental origins of cognitive vulnerability to depression: Negative interpersonal context leads to personal vulnerability. *Cognitive Therapy & Research*, 25, 349-351.
- Angold, A., Costello, E. J., Messer, S. C., Pickles, A., Winder, F., & Silver, D. (1995). Development of a short questionnaire for use in epidemiological studies of depression in children and adolescents. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 5, 237-249.
- Balkwell, C., Balswick, J., & Balkwell, J.W. (1978). On black and white family patterns in America: Their impact on the expressive aspect of sex-role socialization. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 40, 743-747.
- Berlin, L. J., & Cassidy, J. (2003). Mother's self-reported control of their preschool children's emotional expressiveness: A longitudinal study of associations with infant-mother attachment and children's emotion regulation. *Social Development*, 12, 477-495.
- Blatt, S. J., & Homann, E. (1992). Parent-child interaction in the etiology dependent and self-critical depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 12, 47-91.
- Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (1993). Gender and emotion. In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp.447-460), New York: Guilford Press.
- Carr, J. G., Gilroy, F. D., & Sherman, M. F. (1996). Silencing the self and depression among women: The moderating role of race. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 375-392.
- Carson, J. L., & Parke, R. D. (1996). Reciprocal negative affect in parent-child interactions and children's peer competency. *Child Development*, 67, 2217-2226.
- Cassano, M., & Perry, Parrish, C. (2007). Influence of gender on parental socialization of children's sadness regulation. *Social Development*, 16, 210-231.
- Cassidy, J., Parke, R. D., Butkovsky, L., & Braungart, J. M. (1992). Family-peer connections: The roles of emotional expressiveness within the family and children's understanding of emotions. *Child Development*, 63, 603-618.
- Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S. L. (1998). The development of depression in children and adolescents. *American Psychologist*, 53, 221-241.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Consedine, N. S., & Magai, C. (2002). The uncharted waters of emotions: Ethnicity, trait emotion and emotion expression in older adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology, 17*, 71-100.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- Denham, S., & Kochanoff, A. (2002). "Why is she crying?" Children's understanding of emotion from preschool to preadolescence. In L. F. Barrett & P. Salovey (Eds.). *The wisdom in feeling: Psychological processes in emotional intelligence. Emotions and social behavior* (pp. 239-270, New York: Guilford Press.
- Division of Statistics and Scientific Computing Consulting Group. (1995). Factor analysis using SAS Proc Factor. University of Texas at Austin.  
[http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor\\_ut.htm](http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/sas/library/factor_ut.htm).
- Dix, T. (1991). The affective organization of parenting: Adaptive and maladaptive processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 3-25.
- Duggal, S., Carlson, E. A., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (2001). Depressive symptomatology in childhood and adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology, 13*, 143-164.
- Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L. (1998). Parental Socialization of Emotion. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*, 241-273.
- Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1994). Mothers' reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to children's temperament and anger behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 40*, 138-156.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Murphy, B. C. (1996). Parents' reactions to children's negative emotions: Relations to children's social competence and comforting behavior. *Child Development, 67*, 2227-2247.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B. C., & Reiser, M. (1999). Parental reactions to children's negative emotions: Longitudinal relations to quality of children's social functioning. *Child Development, 70*, 513-534.
- Ensminger, M. E., Forrest, C. B., & Riley, A. W. (2000). The validity of measures of socioeconomic status of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*, 392-419.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G\*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*

*Research Methods*, 39, 175-191.

Fife-Schaw, C. (2007). Chris' Calculator Utility [Online statistical tool]. Guilford, Surrey: University of Surrey.

Fisher, C. B., Hoagwood, K., Boyce, C., Duster, T., Frank, D. A., Grisso, T., Levine, R. J., et al. (2002). Research ethics for mental health science involving ethnic minority children and youths. *American Psychologist*, 57, 1024-1040.

Fivush, R. (1998). Methodological challenges in the study of emotion socialization, *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 317-333.

Fuchs, D., & Thelen, M. H. (1988). Children's expected interpersonal consequences of communicating their affective state and reported likelihood of expression. *Child Development*, 58, 1314-1322.

Garber, J., & Flynn, C. (2001). Predictors of depressive cognitions in young adolescents. *Cognitive Therapy & Research*, 25, 353-376.

Garner, P. W. (2006). Prediction of prosocial and emotional competence from maternal behavior in African American preschoolers. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12, 179-198.

Garner, P. W., & Power, T. G. (1996). Preschoolers' emotional control in the disappointment paradigm and its relation to temperament, emotional knowledge, and family expressiveness. *Child Development*, 67, 1406-1419.

Garner, P. W., & Spears, F. M. (2000). Emotion regulation in low-income preschoolers. *Social Development*, 9, 246-264.

Garside, R. B. (2004). *Parental socialization of discrete positive and negative emotions: Implications for emotional functioning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Catholic University of America.

Garside, R. B., & Klimes-Dougan, B. (2002). Socialization of discrete negative emotions: Gender differences and links with psychological distress. *Sex Roles*, 47, 115-129.

Gibbs, J. T. (1990). Mental health issues of black adolescents: Implications for policy and practice. In L. E. Davis & A. R. Stiffman (Eds.), *Ethnic issues in adolescent mental health* (pp. 21-52), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Goodman, S. H., & Gotlib, I. H. (1999). Risk for psychopathology in the children of depressed mothers: A developmental model for understanding mechanisms of transmission. *Psychological Review*, 106, 458-490.

Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., & Hooven, C. (1997). *Meta-emotion: How families communicate*

*emotionally*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Gray-Little, B., & Kaplan, D. A. (1998). Interpretation of psychological tests in clinical and forensic evaluations. In J. H. Sandoval et al. (Eds.), *Test interpretation and diversity: Achieving equity in assessment* (pp. 141-178), Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Greene, A. L. (1990). Patterns of affectivity in the transition to adolescence. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 50, 340-356.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.
- Haglund, K. J., Clay, D. L., Frank, R. B., Beck, N. C., Kashani, J. H., Hewett, K., et al. (1994). Assessing anger expression in children and adolescents. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 19, 291-304.
- Halberstadt, A. G. (1986). Family socialization of emotional expression and nonverbal communication styles and skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 827-836.
- Halberstadt, A. G., Beale, K., Parker, A. E., Stelter, R. L., Craig, A. B., & Bryant, A. Jr. (2006, July). *Parents beliefs about children's emotions: Development of a questionnaire*. In A. G. Halberstadt & J. C. Dunsmore (Chairs). Parental socialization of emotion. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the International Society for Research on Emotion, Atlanta, Ga.
- Harold, G. T., Fincham, F. D., Osborne, L. N., & Conger, R. D. (1997). Mom and dad are at it again: Adolescent perceptions of marital conflict and adolescent psychological distress. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 333-350.
- Harter, S. (1988). *Manual for the self-perception profile for adolescents*. University of Denver.
- Hersh, M. A. (2006). *The impact of observed parental emotion socialization on adolescent self-medication*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Herzberger, S. D., & Hall, J. A. (1993). Consequences of retaliatory aggression against siblings and peers: Urban minority children's expectations. *Child Development*, 64, 1773-1785.
- Hess, U., Senecal, S., Kirouac, G., Herrera, P., Philippot, P., & Kleck, R. E. (2000). Emotional expressivity in men and women: Stereotypes and self-perceptions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14, 609-642.

- Hipwell, A., Keenan, K., Kasza, K., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Bean, T. (2008). Reciprocal influences between girls' conduct problems and depression, and parental punishment and warmth: A six year prospective analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36, 663-677.
- Hughes, D., Bachman, M. A., Ruble, D. N., & Fuligni, A. (2006). Tuned in or tuned out: Parents' and children's interpretation of parental racial/ethnic socialization practices. In L. Balter & C. S. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Child psychology: A handbook of contemporary issues* (2nd ed.; pp. 591-610), New York: Psychology Press.
- Hunziker, J. (1995). *Attachment, emotion socialization, and social competence*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Long Island University, Brooklyn.
- Izard, C. E., & Malatesta, C. Z. (1987). Perspectives on emotional development. I. Differential emotions theory of early emotional development. In J. D. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (2nd ed., pp.494-554). New York: Wiley.
- Jones, S., Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., MacKinnon, D. P. (2002). Parents' reactions to elementary school children's negative emotions: Relations to social and emotional functioning at school. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 48, 133-160.
- Katz, L. F., & Hunter, E. C. (in press). *Maternal meta-emotion philosophy and adolescent depressive symptomatology*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Klimes-Dougan, B., Brand, A., & Garside, R. B., (2001, August). Factor structure, reliability, and validity of an emotion socialization scale. In C. O'Neal (Chair), *Multiple approaches to emotion socialization: Methodology and emotional development*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Klimes-Dougan, B., Brand, A. E., Zahn-Waxler, C., Usher, B., Hastings, P. D., Kendziora, K., & Garside, R. B. (2007). Parental emotion socialization in adolescence: Differences in sex, age, and problem status. *Social Development*, 16, 326-342 .
- Klimes-Dougan, B., & Zeman, J. (2007). Introduction to the special issue of social development: emotion socialization in childhood and adolescence. *Social Development*, 16, 203-209.
- Krause, E. D., Mendelson, T., & Lynch, T. R. (2003). Childhood emotional invalidation and adult psychological distress: The mediating role of emotional inhibition. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 199-213.
- Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G., Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E. (1996). Changes



in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. *Developmental Psychology*, 32, 744-754.

Lawson, W. B. (1986). Racial and ethnic factors in psychiatric research. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry*, 37, 50-54.

Le, H., Berenbaum, H., & Raghavan, C. (2002). Culture and alexithymia: Mean levels, correlates, and the role of parental socialization of emotions. *Emotion*, 2, 341-360.

Loehlin, J. C. (2004). *Latent variable models: an introduction to factor, path, and structural equation analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Magai, C. (1996). *Emotions as a Child: Adult Version*. Unpublished scale, Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York.

Magai, C., & O'Neal, C. (2003). *Emotions as a Child: Parent Version*. Unpublished scale, Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York.

Malatesta, C. Z., & Haviland, J. M. (1982). Learning display rules: The socialization of emotion expression in infancy. *Child Development*, 53, 991-1003.

Malatesta, C. Z., & Wilson, A. (1988). Emotion cognition interaction in personality development: A discrete emotions, functionalist analysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 79, 91-112.

Manning, J. S. (2005). *Ethnic differences in adolescent depressive symptomatology*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Matsumoto, D. (1993). Ethnic differences in affect intensity, emotion judgments, display rule attitudes, and self-reported emotional expression in an American sample. *Motivation and Emotion*, 17, 107-123.

McCranie, E. W., & Bass, J. D. (1984). Childhood family antecedents of dependency and self-criticism: Implications for depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 93, 3-8.

Miller, P., & Sperry, L. L. (1987). The socialization of anger and aggression. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 33, 1-31.

O'Neal, C., & Magai, C. (2005). Do parents respond in different ways when children feel different emotions? The emotional context of parenting. *Development and Psychopathology*, 17, 467-487.

Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C., & Weiss, R. (1989). Sex differences in the consequences that children anticipate for aggression. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 312-319.

Plant, E. A., Hyde, J. S., Keltner, D., & Devine, P. G. (2000). The gender stereotyping of

- emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 81-92.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 119-125.
- Roberts, W. (1994, June). *The socialization of emotional expression: Relations with competence in preschool*. Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association, Penticton, Canada.
- Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A. J., Chavous, T. M., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A. (1997). Multidimensional inventory of Black identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 805-815.
- Sheeber, L., Davis, B., Hops, H., & Leve, C. (2003). *Parental influences on adolescent emotion regulation. An indirect model of adolescent depression*. Paper presented to the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Tampa, FL.
- Smith, M., & Walden, T. (1998). Developmental trends in emotion understanding among a diverse sample of African-American preschool children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 19, 177-197.
- Sroufe, L. A. (1996). *Emotional development: The organization of emotional life in the early years*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stearns, C. Z. (1993). Sadness. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 547-561). New York: Guilford Press.
- Steinberg, L., & Silk, J. S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Vol.1: Children and parenting* (pp. 103-133). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. 2. Negative affects*. New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1991). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. 3. Anger and fear*. New York: Springer.
- Toth, S. L., Manly, J. T., & Cicchetti, D. (1992). Child maltreatment and vulnerability to depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 4, 97-112.
- Vilker, R. (2000). *Adult attachment and the socialization of emotions*. Unpublished manuscript, Long Island University, Brooklyn.
- White, K. R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 9, 461-481.

- Wong, M. S., McElwain, N. L., & Halberstadt, A. (2009). Parent, family, and child characteristics: Associations with mother- and father-reported emotion socialization practices. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 452-463.
- Zahn-Waxler, C. (2000). The development of empathy, guilt, and internalization of distress. In R. Davidson (Ed.), *Wisconsin symposium on emotion: Vol. I: Anxiety, depression, and emotion* (222-265). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Klimes-Dougan, B., & Slattery, M. (2000). Internalizing problems of childhood and adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 443-466.
- Zeman, J., & Shipman, K. (1997). Social-contextual influences on expectancies for managing anger and sadness: The transition from middle-childhood to adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 917-924.